STUDIA TRADITIONIS THEOLOGIAE

Explorations in Early and Medieval Theology

Theology continually engages with its past: the people, experience, Scriptures, liturgy, learning and customs of Christians. The past is preserved, rejected, modified; but the legacy steadily evolves as Christians are never indifferent to history. Even when engaging the future, theology looks backwards: the next generation's training includes inheriting a canon of Scripture, doctrine, and controversy; while adapting the past is central in every confrontation with a modernity.

This is the dynamic realm of tradition, and this series' focus. Whether examining people, texts, or periods, its volumes are concerned with how the past evolved in the past, and the interplay of theology, culture, and tradition.

STUDIA TRADITIONIS THEOLOGIAE

Explorations in Early and Medieval Theology

21

THE LORD’S PRAYER

Origins and Early Interpretations

David Clark

BREPOLS

Cover illustration:
Tabula Peutingeriana © ÖNB Vienna: Cod. 324, Segm. VIII + IX

D/2016/0095/126
ISBN 978-2-503-56537-8
e-ISBN 978-2-503-56896-6
DOI 10.1484/M.STT-EB.5.110928

Printed on acid-free paper

For my beloved sister Kimberly Ann

'In righteousness I shall gaze upon your face; when I awake I shall be satisfied, for I shall see you as you really are.'

Psalm 17:15

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

I. Exegesis and Hermeneutic

The understanding of a Biblical text emerges from the history of its understanding. As we attempt to hear the voices of the past, we bear in mind that their message comes to us in a mediated form. The transmission of a text is not merely a process of oral repetition, nor a simple re-recording of words. As parables and axioms, epic stories and prayers are passed from person-to-person and generation-to-generation, interpretations are also conveyed. These are colored by language, culture, theology, personal experience and historical setting. A teaching given by Jesus over two thousand years ago has traveled a long road to reach the modern ear. The person who seeks to fully understand *what it means* must make it her endeavor to understand *what it has meant* along the way. The purpose of Biblical exegesis is to draw out the original sense of a text. The presupposition of the historical-critical method is that through the study of a text's language, its literary context, its theological context and the historical setting of the author and audience — one can arrive at the author's intended meaning. Once this original message has been retrieved, it is then often supposed that the meaning of a text can be apprehended by the modern reader.[1]

[1] Bockmuehl (2006), 44-45, notes that advocates of the historical-critical method 'too frequently presuppose that the interpretation of the text will take care of itself if only we get the historical problems sorted out ... There is widespread delusion among historical critics of every confessional stripe that the results of such study are themselves self-evidently relevant to the "real" meaning of the New Testament — not just as ancient text, but even as foundation document of Christian faith.'

The philosopher Hans Georg Gadamer, however, has cast significant doubt upon this notion. In his classic study *Truth and Method*, Gadamer denies the possibility of historical transposition. He insists that a text is a historical phenomenon representing the finite communication between author and recipient, and therefore a later reader cannot be a text's addressee. He says:

> The text that is understood historically is forced to abandon its claim to be saying something true. We think we understand when we see the past from a historical standpoint — i.e., transpose ourselves into the historical situation and try to reconstruct the historical horizon. In fact, however, we have given up the claim to find in the past any truth that is valid and intelligible for ourselves.[2]

Gadamer argues that when the modern exegete attempts to understand a text within its original historical context, the history which stands between that person and the text cannot be circumvented. Historical events can only be seen through a horizon. In the case of biblical texts, this horizon represents its history of interpretation, or *tradition*. He therefore asserts that

> the abstract antithesis between tradition and historical research, between history and the knowledge of it, must be discarded. The effect (*Wirkung*) of a living tradition and the effect of historical study must constitute a unity of effect, the analysis of which would reveal only a texture of reciprocal effects. Hence we would do well not to regard historical consciousness as something radically new — as it seems at first — but as a new element in what has always constituted the human relation to the past. In other words, we have to recognize the element of tradition in historical research and inquire into its hermeneutic productivity.[3]

In saying this, Gadamer does not deny the legitimacy of historical-critical exegesis. What he advocates is a methodology wherein historical study is carried out with an awareness of living tradition. Tradition is alive because 'our historical consciousness is always filled with a variety of voices in which the echo of the past is heard. Only in the multifari-

2 Gadamer (1989), 302-303.

3 Gadamer (1989), 283-284.

ousness of such voices does it exist.'[4] He therefore concludes that 'understanding is to be thought of less as a subjective act than as participating in an event of tradition, a process of transmission in which past and present are constantly mediated.'[5]

This hermeneutical integration of 'history and the knowledge of it' characterizes Gadamer's notion of effective history (*Wirkungsgeschichte*). It is a methodological approach to a text's reception history that acknowledges the interdependence between contemporary understanding (i.e. *effect*) and all the understandings (or *effects*) which have preceded it. One of its fundamental tenets is that exegesis must be integrated with a hermeneutic of historical consciousness.

Many scholars believe that this particular methodology is urgently needed in modern biblical studies.[6] Citing the situation in the twentieth century, Ulrich Luz notes that

> historical-critical exegesis is becoming ever more obsessed with detail and ... takes such exaggerated interest in the original sense of letters and strokes of the text that there is little room for any unified understanding of the whole. Historical-critical research is largely uninfluenced by hermeneutical theory, and hermeneutics in turn no longer issues in a methodology for historical-critical work ... The historical-critical understanding of a text isolates its original sense from the present-day exegete as well as from all exegetes of the past by attempting as far as possible to exclude from the process of interpretation the present situation of the exegete and all that has since occurred in history.[7]

The purpose of this present work is to integrate historical-critical exegesis with the hermeneutic of 'historical consciousness' in the development of a limited *Wirkungsgeschichte,* or an effective history of a Gospel text.[8] My premise is that the understanding of a New Testament text

[4] Gadamer (1989), 285

[5] Gadamer (1989), 291.

[6] Bockmuehl (2006), 67, notes, 'The need for such a pursuit of effective history is in fact coming to be recognized by scholars from a great variety of theological presuppositions, including Ulrich Luz (1985-2002; 1.78-82; 1994:23-38), Robert Morgan (1996b:128-151), Heikki Raisanen (1992 and 2000a), and others.'

[7] Luz (2005), 268.

[8] For our purposes, 'reception history,' 'history of influence,' 'effective history,' '*Wirkungsgeschichte*,' and 'history of interpretation' will all be understood synonymously. For a discussion on the nuances of these various terms see Luz (2005), 351-352.

emerges from the history of its understanding, as Markus Bockmuehl notes:

> Its place in history clearly comprises not just an original setting but a history of lived responses to the historical and eternal realities to which it testifies. The meaning of a text is in practice deeply intertwined with its own tradition of hearing and heeding, interpretation and performance. Only the totality of that tradition can begin to give a view of the New Testament's real historical footprint.[9]

This is to say that the fullness of a text's meaning will be uncovered only as one sees its *original meaning* through the horizon of the *history of its meaning*. Thus, the object of our enquiry must not be limited to an analysis of the *ideas* embodied in the words of a text. We must also endeavor to uncover the 'history of lived responses' among the communities who have embraced its message.

The text we shall consider is the prayer commonly referred to as the 'Lord's Prayer' (LP). Given the widespread use of this text during two thousand years of Christian study and practice, I recognize the need to focus on a particular season of its tradition. Consequently, our survey will be limited to a period of approximately two hundred years. We will begin with its origin as an oral teaching of Jesus, and then follow its transmission in the first century through Matthew, Luke, and the *Didache*. Our survey will then culminate with Tertullian's commentary dating from the early third century. Our analysis of the LP within this particular period will allow us to see how the group of ideas embodied in this prayer, and the notion of prayer itself, fared amidst epic religious transitions: from Judaism to Jesus, from Jesus to the Gospels, and from the Gospels to early catholic Christianity.[10]

As we survey the interpretation of this prayer through these historical vicissitudes, we will discover that in many ways, it is the story of hermeneutical liberty. Luz remarks that,

[9] Bockmuehl (2006), 65.

[10] Dunn (1990), 344, identifies Early Catholicism by three main features: 1) The fading of the imminent expectation of the Parousia; 2) Increasing institutionalization, which included, 'the emergence of the concept of office, of a distinction between clergy and laity, of a priestly hierarchy, of apostolic succession, of sacramentalism, of an identification between church and institution,' and 3) The emergence of a rule of faith, 'with the specific aim of providing a bulwark against enthusiasm and false teaching.'

> This freedom in interpretation has to do above all with the fact that the purpose of the biblical message is to speak, time and again, to new people in new situations and to be interpreted in new ways in their lives. The proclamation and activity of Jesus establish the freedom which we see at work in the later actualizations. This means that biblical texts are similar to many other texts in that they do not have a fixed, definable sense which can be established once and for all. Their meaning is not simply identical with their original sense. Rather, they can be said to have a firm basis and a directionality which continually open up new meanings.[11]

From the time of its origin, the LP has invited new interpretation and applications. Through the history of its transmission, it has held open the continual possibility of new understanding. This is not to say, however, that it can mean *anything*.[12] The story of this prayer's interpretation is also one of limitations. In its initial utterance, it created parameters of meaning. The language and the imagery of the text established a directionality. Our survey will reveal many boundaries of meaning that our interpreters felt compelled to honor.

II. Methodological Considerations

A. Historical-Critical Methods

As we have stated above, our strategy in this work is to integrate historical-critical analysis and hermeneutical theory. There are certain presuppositions within this methodology that merit further clarification. With regard to historical-critical approaches, we will implement those methods which are suitable for each stage of the prayer's transmission. Consideration will be given to the unique objectives of the transmitters. In some cases, it will be seen that the LP was significant for its place in the theological history of Israel. Other interpreters emphasized its philosophical soundness and innate rationality. For others, the prayer was significant because it addressed a particular need of their community's

[11] Luz (2005), 276-277.

[12] Luz (2005), 324, notes: 'Texts contain guidance strategies and possibilities of freedom enabling open communication between text and readers. By shifting its interest from author to reader, exegesis becomes the agent of religious pluralism. The biblical texts do not prevent this pluralism. Rather, their continual openness to new and different readings has given rise to pluralism. But "different readings" does not mean that any reading is possible. "Some interpretations are possible, but not all."'

Sitz im Leben. Our goal is to honor the interpretive priorities of each transmitter. Consequently, we will be adept with our analytical tools. Additionally, we bear in mind that each form of transmission is unique. For example, redaction analysis will be an important tool in discovering what the LP meant to Matthew and Luke, both of whom compiled their Gospels from various sources. Such is not the case, however, with regard to Tertullian, whose primary work on the LP was a teaching delivered to catechists. Once again we note that a certain degree of methodological flexibility is in order.

With regard to hermeneutical theory, there are two components of our methodology that require explanation. The first concerns our attempt to integrate both synchronic and diachronic theories. The second is the implementation of the 'continuum method,' wherein the interpretation of a text is framed within its anterior and posterior reception history.

B. Synchronic and Diachronic Exegesis

A word can have many meanings. We take, for illustrative purposes, the address with which our text begins: *Father*. In first-century Palestine, this word had various significations. For example, it could refer to a male parent, to an ancestor, or to God. The nuances of its meaning were culturally and linguistically determined. Hence, אָב may have been something other than אַבָּא, which may have been something other than πάτερ, which may have been something other than *pater*. And we must concede that our modern term *father* may not be exactly on par with any of these.

So the question is: When we encounter any of these *father* terms in an ancient text, how can we determine what exactly the author meant to say? The answer given by the historical-critical exegete is that the meaning of a text can be determined contextually. In studying a passage from the first century which contains the word *father,* the exegete might ask questions regarding its sociological implications, its literary context, its semantic range, its use in other ancient texts, its theological usage, etc.

However, the irony of these scientific methodologies is that they may actually obscure the original sense of the text more than uncover it. A purely contextual interpretation potentially hinders our endeavor to understand what the author meant to communicate. For if our understanding of *father* is constrained by what we infer from language, culture, historical setting, etc., then we place limitations upon what the author was able to say. We exclude the option of innovation. That is, we

disallow the possibility that he may have, in fact, created new meaning. Ernst Troeltsch has framed this issue in the following way:

> Present-day science of religion labours under the same major difficulty as all other studies of culture, viz. that the decisive fundamental assumption which will determine its treatment of the subject must be made at the outset and that this assumption then dominates the whole subsequent treatment in all its aspects. The question which has to be decided is how to view the great cultural creations of the human spirit: whether to see in them independent dispositions and forces of the spirit which give form to their own ideas and values on the basis of their own internal necessity, or whether to see in the spirit nothing but the formal power which orders positive facts, when they have been apprehended as objectively as possible, into a coherent system of generalizations and then makes this system serve the human goals of self-preservation and the progress of the species.[13]

We thus ask: *In the process of human communication, are we creators of significations or do we merely interpret and order pre-established linguistic conventions*? As Troeltsch suggests, our predisposition with regard to this issue will determine the way that we read Scripture. The diachronic exegete assumes that man is the creator of meaning.[14] Thus, Scriptural texts represent the intended meaning of the author. Language was a tool utilized by the authors to create significations, which in turn produced religious change. John Riches notes that 'on this view true religious innovations were independent both of the religious tradition from which they sprang and of the social, political, economic and technological circumstances of their times.'[15] On the other hand, a synchronic reading of a text denies the possibility of pure innovation in communication. Language is viewed as a semiotic system which imposes significations upon man.[16] Meaning is not a product of human creation, but rather a reflection of the cultural conventions and order within which men and

[13] Ernst Troeltsch as cited by Riches (1980), 14, (italics by Riches).

[14] Patte (1976), 13n, comments: 'A diachronic exegetical study has as ultimate object to point out what the author meant, and therefore the intentional changes in symbols, traditions, and ideas ... For the traditional historical exegete, man is primarily a creator of significations.'

[15] Riches (1980), 20.

[16] Patte (1976), 15, notes: 'The structural analyst studies this language without concern for what the author meant (the traditionally understood semantic dimension of the text). Yet language itself has a semantic dimension. When language imposes itself upon man, significations are also imposed upon man.'

women dwell. Riches concludes that 'on such a view religious change is largely determined by changes in its world.'[17] He continues:

> The question here is in what relation does the innovator stand to the language, forms and conventions which he inherits? While indeed new forms may be created, it is very rare that such forms bear no relation whatsoever to those that have gone before. Similarly, if he uses terms and sentences which bear no relation to previous uses, he will simply not be understood.[18]

Thus, the innovator of religious change is a woman or man who is able to take culturally recognizable terminologies, texts, oral traditions, myths, axioms and metaphors — and give them new meaning. However, there are limitations with regard to how far the original sense of these conventions can be stretched. Each form of communication holds a range of meaning. To move outside of that range is to lose the ability to communicate. Consequently, the attempt to create new meaning must be held in tension with inherited significations.

Our conclusion is that 'man is viewed as a semantic agent upon whom significations are also imposed.'[19] Innovative communication is possible, but it remains dependent upon inherited language, forms and conventions. New meaning can be created, but it is always tethered to inherited semantic significations.

C. *Continuity and Discontinuity*

A synchronic approach to a text assumes that the author is conveying only what has been imposed upon him. Thus, when we read the word *father* in any given text, the range of possible significations is limited to those which the author inherited from his own family, culture, language, etc. If the conventional understanding was that a father is a biological male parent, then this is how we interpret the term. The author is perpetuating, or continuing, a conventional interpretation.

In contrast, a diachronic reading allows for the possibility of innovation. This can occur, for example, when the author implements inherited significations within new contexts and with new associations. Utilizing this approach, when we read the word *father,* we look for contextual

[17] Riches (1980), 20.

[18] Riches (1980), 17.

[19] Patte (1976), 19.

clues that may reveal the author's intention to communicate something other than the conventional understanding. For example, the author may be intending to introduce the notion that the *true father* is God. In such a case, the creation of new meaning has occurred, and the transmission is characterized by discontinuity with the anterior tradition.

A proper analysis of a text's effective history is one that is particularly sensitive to patterns of synchronic continuity and diachronic discontinuity. This same concern characterizes what Tom Holmen has described as the 'continuum approach.' He explains that 'both continuity and discontinuity are involved as modes of historical *èvenément*. On various issues Jesus may have departed from or adhered to Judaism, and again, early Christianity may have departed from or adhered to the Jesuanic proclamation. In each case, however, scholarship is obliged to account for the elements of discontinuity and continuity. The continuum approach challenges scholars to explain "why," and this applies to each phase of transition, whether Judaism-Jesus or Jesus-Christianity, as well as to both the continuity and discontinuity modes of transition. "Continuum" thus denotes the attempt to take note of the interaction and interdependence of the various phenomena of history, and to avoid treating them as isolated from each other. In particular, the continuum approach maintains that a phenomenon is seriously determinable only in the light of its anterior and posterior history.'[20]

Thus, as we look at each stage of the LP's interpretation history, we will bear in mind that our exegesis must be explicable in the light of the anterior and posterior stages in the effective history of this prayer. This is to say that Jesus must be fully integrated into his Jewish context. Whatever it is that he intended to communicate through the LP can only be determined in consideration of contemporaneous Jewish prayer tradition and theology. In the same way, the teachings of Jesus must be fully integrated with the early traditions of the church. The phenomenon of the LP as it stands within the proclamation of Jesus must be evaluated in the light of his early interpreters.

Explaining the rationale behind this approach, Holmen notes that, 'A Jesus who can be placed within early Judaism but who cannot be understood in relation to early Christianity is no more historically plausible than a Jesus who can be combined with nascent Christianity while remaining an enigma as a Jew of his time.'[21] He continues:

[20] Holmen (2007), 2.

[21] Holmen (2007), 4.

> It is, in general, probable that instead of a clear-cut creation of the Christian imagination or a slavish repetition of the given, concepts that can most often account for the relation between Jesus and early Christianity are development and unfoldment. Indeed, these work in all directions. Jesus did not repetitively borrow from his contemporaries nor did he appear to be coming from outside his context, but he showed originality in applying ideas that were familiar to the Jewish tradition. Similarly, early Christianity did not simply copy what Jesus had proclaimed nor did they go into a large-scale manufacture of Jesus traditions *ex nihilo*. Therefore, it should be legitimate to begin with the assumption that, by being explained, discontinuities between Jesus and early Christianity usually turn out to exhibit development and unfoldment rather than detachment, and that a genuine starting point in Jesus' mission and message still often underlies them.[22]

It will thus be taken for granted throughout this work that: 1) There was a historical starting point for the LP in the message of Jesus, 2) The context within which we must interpret his mission and message is first-century Palestinian Judaism. Jesus was not separate from his heritage and faith, even as his particular interpretation of prayer made him unique, and 3) Early Christian interpretations of the LP represent progression in the Christ story, not its invention.

It will be seen throughout this work that the effective history of the LP is the story of possibilities within parameters. We will explore the symbolic universe of five individuals or communities: Jesus, Matthew, the *Didache* community, Luke, and Tertullian. These will not be five disparate studies. Rather, in the diversity of interpretations, a fundamental unity will be discernible. My intention, however, is not to *force* a

[22] Holmen (2007), 11. The continuum approach, with its emphasis on *interaction* and *interdependence*, is providing a needed corrective to traditional Form Criticism. Scholarship of the twentieth century left many with the impression that the Jesus of history was virtually irretrievable. Jesus was only knowable behind the Gospels, but not through them [see Wright (1996a), 29-35]. The Jesus of history was thus separated from the kerygmatic Christ. Early Christianity is often portrayed as having little relationship to the Jesus of history. And the Gospel accounts, it is suggested, tell us more about the early Christian communities than they tell us about Jesus. The ultimate consequence of this methodology is that the Gospels are seen as little more than allegories. Francis Watson (1998), 210, calls attention to 'the problem that almost inevitably recurs wherever a Gospel is interpreted in the light of its hypothetical original communal setting: in such an interpretation, an allegorical reading strategy is employed that systematically downplays and circumvents the literal sense of the text.' Form Criticism thus becomes, 'vulnerable to the criticism that it is fundamentally arbitrary ... it actually succeeds in making a more-or-less readable and comprehensible text unreadable and incomprehensible.' [Watson (1998), 213]

uniformity upon these texts, but to approach each author objectively, allowing them to speak for themselves. As a result, this *unity* may be slow to emerge. We bear in mind the cautions of Eric Osborn:

> The history of ideas functions neither by following the same agenda nor by building bit-by-bit a final scheme. Discontinuity outstrips continuity. Yet what the mid-term says is the way to understand the continuity and discontinuity between the two extremes ... in a word, the middle is never merely a revision of the beginning and never simply an anticipation of the end, but a statement in its own right which may enable the move between the two designated extremes to be understood.[23]

III. Overview

Our analysis will progress as follows:

The aim of the first two chapters is to place Jesus and his prayer within the historical setting of first-century Palestinian Judaism. Chapter one explores the symbolic significance of prayer, with the aim of identifying what Jesus held in common with his Jewish contemporaries, and what made him different. At that time, prayer was occupying an increasingly important role amidst various Jewish movements. It was being perceived as a form of sacrifice, through which the spirituality of the Temple could be replicated in the lives of ordinary people. Jesus' teaching on prayer is best understood in the context of this movement, yet his interpretation of prayer was also unique. The LP was given to reveal his particular understanding of prayer and to mark the particular identity of his followers.

In the second chapter, we will place the LP within the narrative theology of Jesus. It will be seen that the overarching purpose of this prayer was the renewal of the Deuteronomic covenant. Jesus taught that the one true God had chosen Israel as the one people through whom He would establish His reign on earth. He intended this prayer to be a means by which the ancient covenant would be re-affirmed, continued, and ultimately fulfilled. As his followers would speak this prayer, and as its effect took hold on the earth, Israel would take her rightful place of honor among the nations, and YHWH would be universally acknowledged as the one true God.

[23] Osborn (1997), 254.

Whereas our opening two chapters reveal the way that Jesus interpreted Judaism, chapter three will provide our first glimpse of how the Gospel authors interpreted Jesus. The Gospel of Matthew is the earliest written record of the LP. We will see that one of the predominant leitmotifs of his text is the relationship between heaven and earth. In Matthew's worldview, these realms stand in distinction and in tension. The formative church, which finds itself straddling both the earthly and heavenly realms, is called to mediate the process that will ultimately be consummated in their union. The result will be *new genesis* for the whole of creation. Matthew presents the LP as a means by which the church exercises its meditative, catalytic role.

In chapter four we will look through the window of the *Didache* upon early Christian communities at prayer. For those believers that lived according the *Didache*'s *program of discipleship*, daily participation in the LP served to reinforce the community ethos and worldview. These were people who saw themselves on a path toward sanctification. They held a very idealistic picture of future perfection, yet they realized that it was sometimes a slow and painful journey toward its realization. The daily recitation of LP functioned to reaffirm the identity of the community, and to legitimate its values in light of the community worldview. The sacrality of the community, the coming restoration, the ethical commitment to be righteous, the responsibility to share, the need for ongoing confession and mercy, and the imperative to overcome evil and sin were all articulated through the words of this prayer. This ritual of legitimation was necessary for the perseverance of the community on the path to perfection.

In the fifth chapter, we encounter the LP in the rich theological setting of Luke's Gospel. Two concerns shape Luke's presentation of this prayer: 1) Its integration within his highly developed theology of prayer, and 2) Its communicability to his Gentile audience. Prayer is one of the major themes of Luke-Acts, and he goes to great lengths to model it, teach it, and document how God answers it. He wants his audience to pray, but he also wants them to *put into action* the things that they request from God. Consequently, Luke's interpretation of the LP is driven by praxis. His approach to this prayer is aptly characterized by the exhortation to *pray and do.*

In our final chapter, we engage with the ecclesiastical world of third-century Roman Carthage. The language of the LP is now Latin, the instructor is the philosopher-*cum*-theologian Tertullian, and the audience is a group of catechumens who are learning the meaning of the LP

in preparation for baptism. Tertullian's objective is that the LP would *make sense* to these new Christians, and he borrows heavily from Stoic philosophy to communicate its meaning. The LP for Tertullian is the rational articulation of the *Logos*. It is one of the means by which God gives shape, order, beauty and continuity to His creation. Tertullian sees this prayer as an operative force, wherein God invites man to collaborate with Him in bringing about the fulfillment of His purposes in history.

At the conclusion, we will step back to look at the story as a whole. Our aim will be to identify what threads were continued, and what threads were broken during those first two hundred years of the LP's effective history. We bear in mind that the challenge set before us is not simply to document continuity and change, but to explain *why*. Why did certain lines of interpretation remain unbroken, and why did new interpretations emerge? This is a question that must be addressed both historically and philosophically.[24] My hope is that the outcome of this analysis will not only increase our awareness of what has happened in the past, but that it will open the door to a deeper understanding of the ongoing history in which we ourselves participate.

[24] With regard to philosophy, we will test the validity of Gadamer's hermeneutical theory. If he is correct, then the 'texture of reciprocal effects' must be discernible. The relationship between 'history and the knowledge of it' will be evident at each stage of the LP's transmission. With regard to history, we will look for plausibility structures in the historical setting that would explain either continuity or discontinuity.

CHAPTER ONE: PRAYER IN FIRST-CENTURY PALESTINE

I. Introduction

A. Interpretation and Identity

Jesus was an interpreter of Judaism. His life and teaching were events of tradition, processes of transmission in which his own present and past were constantly mediated.[1] As a Jewish man leading a group of fellow Jews, Jesus communicated within synchronic boundaries. He had inherited a semiotic system comprised of language, rituals, traditions and cultural metaphors which communicated the historical Jewish worldview. In many ways, the meanings of these symbols were imposed upon him. In order to be understood, he had no choice but to communicate by means of these forms. It is for this reason that it is impossible to separate Jesus from the Judaism of his day.[2] He was a product and a reflection of his culture.

Jesus was also an innovator who transformed traditional cultural symbols. He implemented the semantic significations that he had inherited within new contexts and associations. He took culturally recognizable terminologies, texts, oral traditions, myths, axioms and metaphors — and gave them new meaning. These new interpretations resulted in

[1] I am here re-phrasing Gadamer (1989), 291.

[2] Holmen (2007), 3, notes that, 'Jesus was not a different Jew, as such standing on the verge of becoming non-Jewish. Instead, with all his differences he inherently formed part of the diverse and heterogeneous Jewish religiosity also called early "Judaisms."' Jesus was not the innovator of a separate religious system, as Neusner (1991) has suggested.

a new expression of the Jewish faith, which subsequently came to be known as Christianity.

In first-century Palestine there were diverse perspectives on traditional Jewish symbols, resulting in what many have referred to as diverse *Judaisms*[3] While Jesus himself cannot be characterized as being within the boundaries of any particular school or *hairesis*, he was neither an oddity nor a pariah within his milieu. Many of his beliefs and practices were shared in common with his contemporaries, even as there were other elements of his message and praxis that made him unique.

One of the most potent symbols through which the ethos and worldview of first-century Judaism were expressed was prayer.[4] Through this singular act, the Jewish people declared and reinforced their social identity, acknowledged their historical covenant with YHWH, expressed their hopes for the future, and above all else, proclaimed the absolute lordship of the one and only God.[5] Thus, it is no surprise that as an interpreter of Judaism, we find Jesus teaching his followers a prayer. It was a prayer that acted simultaneously to validate certain historical tenets of the Jewish faith even as it reinterpreted others. It was a prayer that would shape the self-understanding of Jesus' community, ultimately becoming the identity marker of the Christian movement.

Our present endeavor is to explore the landscape of Jewish prayer in the first century, and to locate the message of Jesus within that setting. We shall survey what other Jewish communities believed about prayer, and evaluate how Jesus moved with or against their instruction and praxis. It will be seen that, in accord with many of his contemporaries, Jesus had a conflicted attitude toward the Jerusalem Temple. While honoring the historical significance of the institution, he and many other Jews felt isolated from the Temple, and were consequently reinterpreting its functions and extending them into new settings. That

[3] This pluralistic description of first-century Judaism has become quite common. I prefer the characterization of a singular *Judaism*, with the acknowledgement that there were diverse streams within.

[4] Geertz (1973), 89-90, notes that 'sacred symbols function to synthesize a people's ethos — the tone, character, and quality of their life, its moral and aesthetic style and mood — and their world view — the picture they have of the way things in sheer actuality are, their most comprehensive ideas of order ... Religious symbols formulate a basic congruence between a particular style of life and a specific (if, most often, implicit) metaphysic.'

[5] These affirmations and are evident in the prayer known as the *Amidah* (a.k.a. the *Tefillah* and the *Shemoneh Esre*), which has been the prayer *par excellence* of the Jewish synagogue since the era of the Second Temple. For an early version of this prayer and other ancient Jewish prayer texts see Petuchowski (1978a).

which the Temple sacrifices had originally been intended to attain, namely, intimacy with YHWH, was now being experienced through prayer. These women and men were developing a new understanding of prayer as a metaphor for sacrifice. The age-old association between these two rituals was being reinvigorated and expanded to such an extent that prayer, and not animal sacrifice, was becoming the focal point of worship.

In this context of diachronic innovation there was, however, a distinguishing mark in the teaching of Jesus — a point where he parted ways with his fellow innovators — and this was the exclusivity that Jesus claimed for himself: h*e* was the true Temple, and in him was constituted the ***house of prayer*** for all nations. The invitation to pray ***his way*** with ***his followers*** was a call to experience communion with the Father ***through him.***[6]

B. Text and Ritual

Jewish prayers in the time of Jesus were neither doctrinal compendia nor formulas for spiritual transactions. Rather, the Jews viewed prayer as an experience.[7] James Charlesworth has noted that prayer 'was not an accessory, it was the fabric of existence.'[8] It 'clarified and unified' the days, the times, the seasons and the jubilees. 'Prayer was not only a means of experiencing oneness with oneself and solidarity with Israel (past, present, and future); it was the vehicle by which the devout Jew became united again, after Adam and Eve's trespass, with the cosmos and especially with the Creator.'[9] Prayer was a phenomenon that that

[6] Jeremias (1978), 62, states that in teaching his disciples the LP, Jesus 'gave them a share in his relationship with God.' Wright (1996b), 2, says further that, 'When Jesus gave his disciples this prayer, he was giving them part of his own breath, his own life, his own prayer. The prayer is actually a distillation of his own sense of vocation, his own understanding of his father's purposes.'

[7] Scholars of early Jewish and Christian prayer such as Zahavy (1992), Nickelsburg (2003), and Hoffman (1991), have warned against the tendency to treat prayers simply as texts, with little consideration for their socio-anthropological significance as religious ritual. The theological understanding and ritual application of prayer must be treated as inter-related historical phenomena. Hoffman (1991), 38, comments: 'What we are after is the slippery notion that we call identity ... the ultimate goal is cultural, not textual. We want to unpack the way a group's religious ritual encodes their universe.'

[8] Charlesworth (1993), 52.

[9] Charlesworth (1993), 52.

transcended words, that could not be confined the human vocabulary.[10] It was, at its core, communion with the Divine.

We begin our analysis by taking a broad look at the significance of prayer during a time of religious upheaval. Prayer was the impetus behind a shift of influence away from the priestly hierarchy and the Temple cultus, toward smaller communities of common Jews. We will first evaluate the historical and theological underpinnings of this movement. We will then survey how this vision for prayer found expression among specific communities: the Qumran *Yahad*,[11] the Pharisees, and the synagogue congregations of Palestine. We will conclude this chapter evaluating how Jesus' message united him with the other groups within this prayer movement, even as it forged a unique identity for him and his followers.

II. A Prayer Movement

In the period leading up to its destruction in 70 CE, the once emblematic role of the Temple and its priestly hierarchy was diminishing. All that the Temple represented within the Jewish 'sacred cosmos' did not, and could not change. It was the dwelling place of YHWH's glory, and the locus of atonement.[12] Yet many Jews of this period felt disconnected or distanced from the Jerusalem sacrificial system.[13] Consequently, they developed rituals and practices that mirrored the spiritual significance

[10] The apostle Paul noted that prayer at times may take the form of 'groanings too deep for words.'(Rom 8:28) This notion is supported in such passages as Ps 22:1; 77:3, and is illustrated in the case of Hannah (1 Sam 1:13-14).

[11] We follow Wise, et al. (2005), and Collins (2010) in using *Yahad* as an umbrella term for the Essene communities represented by the Dead Sea Scrolls (DSS). Meaning 'unity,' *Yahad* was the preferred self-designation of the movement. The term appears fifty times in 1QS, seven times in 1QSa, and additionally in 4Q174, 4Q177, 4Q252, 4Q265 and CD.

[12] See Wright (1996a), 406-410; Dunn (2006), 46-51.

[13] Several texts from the Pseudepigrapha reveal this trend: I En. 89:73-74; Pss. Sol. 1, 2, 4 and 8; T. Levi 14:5-8; T. Mos. 4-7. Nickelsburg (2003), 155, notes that the 'evidence need not indicate a continuous anti-temple movement over time, or a single anti-Temple party at any given time. Nor do the polemics necessarily stem from a single concern or kind of criticism. Nonetheless, taken together they falsify the notion that all Jews in the postexilic period held the Temple in high regard.' It is important to bear in mind, as Sanders (1992), 52-53, asserts, that the vast majority of Jews in this period still did support and participate in the Temple system.

of the Temple. The notions of sacrality, sacrifice, priestly sanctity and atonement were finding expression in new and creative means.

There was a long-standing tradition in Jewish Scriptures that animal sacrifice in-and-of-itself was not sufficient to make atonement for sin. The prophet Samuel had said to Israel's first king Saul, 'Has the Lord as great delight in burnt offerings and sacrifices, as in obeying the voice of the Lord? Behold, to obey is better than sacrifice, and to listen than the fat of rams.' (1 Sam 15:22) Saul's successor David would pray, 'For you will not delight in sacrifice, or I would give it; you will not be pleased with a burnt offering. The sacrifices of God are a broken spirit; a broken and contrite heart, O God, you will not despise.' (Ps 51:16) The prophet Hosea had declared, 'For I desire steadfast love and not sacrifice, the knowledge of God rather than burnt offerings.' (Hos 6:6) And Isaiah denounced the people and the priests saying,

> 'What to me is the multitude of your sacrifices?' says the Lord; 'I have had enough of burnt offerings of rams and the fat of well-fed beasts; I do not delight in the blood of bulls, or of lambs, or of goats. When you come to appear before me, who has required of you this trampling of my courts? Bring no more vain offerings.' (Isa 1:11-13a)

Throughout the era of Second Temple Judaism, when a Jewish community, for whatever reason, found itself disillusioned, distanced or disconnected from the Jerusalem Temple, these principles would come back into play. There would be increasing emphasis on the notion that the animals offered on the Jerusalem altar did not stand as the sole means of reconciliation with YHWH. Animal sacrifices represented His desire for repentance, obedience, and the honoring of covenant relationship. If a community was not participating in the literal sacrifices of the Jerusalem Temple, there were alternative ways by which they could still participate in a 'spiritual sacrifice.'[14] And one of the primary means by which these communities engaged in this spiritualized Temple ritual was through prayer.[15]

[14] Klawans (2006), 220, argues for cautionary use of the term 'spiritual sacrifice' and proposes that, 'we should speak more neutrally of metaphorical use of sacrificial language.' His concern is that this term may connote the supersession of the animal sacrifices, which is not what I am here suggesting.

[15] This notion is prominent in Talmudic literature. In the wake of the Temple's destruction Rabbi Issac would declare, 'At this time we have neither prophet nor priest, neither sacrifice, nor Temple, nor altar — what is it that can make atonement for us, even though the Temple is destroyed? The only thing that we have left is prayer!' [*Tan-*

As we look at various groups and trends within the Judaism of Jesus' day, we discover the existence of a broad prayer movement. As with many movements, this one had no particular founder or leader. It was incorporated by a broad spectrum of Jews, including Pharisees, synagogues, and the members of the *Yahad*. What the adherents of this movement had in common was a sense of isolation from the Jerusalem Temple. Their reasons varied: some were in active protest due to ideological differences; others were isolated by distance; others participated in the rituals even as they felt a bit disillusioned. To varying degrees, each of these groups used prayer as a way to retrieve and replicate the symbolic significance which the Temple had originally been intended to convey.[16] Lawrence Schiffman notes that

> throughout the Second Commonwealth period, cult was on the wane, and prayer and liturgy were on the rise. Gradually, prayer was making more and more inroads even in the Temple. Those distant from the Temple turned increasingly to prayer ... Pharisaism, in translating Temple purity to the home and table, had helped to free the later sages from the inexorability of cult ... the Qumran sect had long ago demonstrated how to live a Jewish life without a Temple. They had ... developed both a liturgy and an ideology to accommodate their absence from the Temple.[17]

The notion that communion with YHWH could be experienced through prayer, apart from the sacrifices of the Jerusalem Temple, was not a novelty.[18] But the widespread adaptation of this idea across a broad spectrum of communities seems to indicate that first-century Judaism

huma, Way-yislah 9, cited by Heinemann (1977), 20] For additional examples see: b. *Ber.* 26b, 32a; *b. Meg.* 31b; *Taanith* 27b; *b. Menahoth* 110a; *Tanhuma, Tzav; Pesikta de Rav Kahana* 6; *Yalkut* 776.

[16] On general attitudes of discontent toward the Temple in the Second Temple era, see Wright (1996a), 412; Nickelsburg (2003), 94-95, 155; Broadhead (2007), 130. On the gradual waning of participation in the Temple ritual see Gartner (1965), 18. On the democratization of the Temple ritual through prayer see Heinemann (1977), 14-17, 133; Petuchowski (1978b), 46.

[17] Schiffman (1987), 34-35.

[18] Idelsohn (1995), 6, asserts that this notion was engrained in Israel's historical psyche, before and even during the era of the Temple. He cites Heiler: 'In Israel it was the great prophetic activity of Moses to offer prayers to Yahve independent of the sacrificial cult. Although later on the sacrifice occupied a large place in Israel's form of worship, yet the prayers of the great prophets and the psalmists were an approach to God without the mediacy of any sacrifices ... In Hellenistic mysticism, as well as in the prophetic of Israel, there dawned the new idea that prayer is the true and only worthy

was approaching a tipping point.[19] Momentum and influence were shifting away from the priestly hierarchy, and toward smaller communities of ordinary Jews who were reinterpreting the role of the Temple in their daily lives.

III. The Role of Prayer Among the Yahad

A. Introduction

Among the various groups who formed part of this prayer movement, the members of the *Yahad* represent the highest degree of separation from the Jerusalem Temple.[20] Living in a self-imposed exile, the leaders of this community were forced to develop a theology, and even a spiritual cosmology wherein relationship could be maintained with YHWH apart from the traditional system of sacrifice. Prayer became a central element of their praxis, and its significance becomes particularly evident when we consider three aspects of their spiritual paradigm: atonement, 'community as Temple,' and their notion of sacred places. Before we

sacrifice to God. The psalmist says: 'Accept, I beseech Thee, the free-will offering of my mouth,' (Ps 119:108); or 'Let my prayer be set forth as incense before Thee,' (Ps 141: 2).

[19] Contemporary sociological theory, as popularized by Gladwell (2002), characterizes this phenomenon as a moment when ideas, trends or behaviors cross a threshold to become widely embraced in society. While modern theories may or may not explain ancient social phenomena, the reproduction and dissemination of the 'prayer as sacrifice' notion seems to fit this pattern.

[20] The most commonly held interpretive paradigm for the DSS over the past sixty years, often called the Standard Model, holds three basic tenets: 1) The identification of the Qumran Community as part of the Essene sect, 2) The origin of the Qumran community coming in reaction to the Hasmonean takeover of the high-priesthood and, 3) The correlation of the scrolls with the community that inhabited the Khirbet Qumran ruins. For a summary, see Flint and VanderKam (1998-1999). Regarding the first tenet, I maintain with Cross (1973), 331-332; Elledge (2005), 33-53; and Collins (2010), 122-165, that the Qumran community is most properly identified as part of the Essene movement. With regard to the second tenet, the timing and full rationale for the emergence of the Qumran community are the subject of much debate. In spite of strong arguments against the traditional consensus [e.g. Wise (2005), 27-35], I maintain with Milik (1959), Vermes (1954), Cross (1995), and Eshel (2008) that the movement originated in the mid-second century BCE, partly over a dispute regarding priestly succession. Finally, regarding the third tenet of the Standard Model, I maintain that there is a correlation between the scrolls and the community that used the Khirbet Qumran site, with the qualification that the scrolls include the work of many communities that did not occupy that site. Collins (2010), 10, states: 'the sectarian movement known from the Scrolls cannot be identified simply as "the Qumran community." Qumran was at most one of many settlements of the sect.'

consider each of these in detail, we will take a brief glimpse at their history.

B. Historical Background

The *Damascus Document* (CD) 1:3-11 describes how a leader known as the 'Teacher of Righteousness' emerged from the remnant of Israel four hundred and ten years after the Babylonian conquest. The *Commentary on Habakkuk* (1QpHab) describes him as a priest and a skilled teacher who is persecuted by a 'Wicked Priest' and eventually driven into exile.[21] The root cause of this priestly conflict appears to involve, at the very minimum, purity rituals and questions of the ritual calendar.[22] The disruption of the Zadokite priestly lineage under the Hasmonean rulers was an additional factor in this conflict.[23] Ultimately, the movement came to see itself as a company of priests and the heirs of a New Covenant,[24] and its members were subsequently prohibited by their leaders from participating in the sacrifices of the Jerusalem Temple. The Damascus Document states:

> None who have been brought into the covenant shall enter into the sanctuary to light up His altar in vain; they shall 'lock the door,' for God said, 'Would that one of you would lock My door so that you should not light up my altar in vain.' They must be careful to act according to the specifications of the Law for the era of wickedness, separating from corrupt people, avoiding filthy wicked lucre taken from what is vowed or consecrated to God or found in the Temple funds.[25]

The members of the *Yahad* held to the hope that one day they would have victory over their enemies,[26] and that the rightful line of priests

[21] 1QpHab 2:8; 8:3-13; 11:4-7; 12:8-9. Apparently the 'Wicked Priest' is the High Priest in Jerusalem, as the description of his power in 1QpHab is fitting to that position.

[22] See 1QpHab 8:13; 4QMMT. The discovery at Qumran of 1 Enoch, Jubilees and 11Q5 lends support to the notion that this community used a solar calendar, in contrast with the Hasmoneans and later priests who used a lunar calendar.

[23] First proposed by Vermes (1954), this remains the consensus view, although not without challenges. Cf. Wise, et al. (2005), 16-35.

[24] CD 3:12-14:4.

[25] CD 6:11b-16a, [Wise (2005b), 57].

[26] 1QM 1:14-16.

would be restored within a purified Jerusalem Temple. The time would come when, according to 1QM, they would

> take their stand at the burnt offerings and sacrifices, to arrange the sweet-smelling incense according to the will of God, to atone for all His congregation, and to satisfy themselves before Him continually at the table of glory.[27]

But at the present time, they would have to maintain total separation. The Jerusalem system was rotten-to-the-core, and they would have to wait in exile for the time of restoration to come.[28]

C. *Atonement*

Even as they lived and worshiped in isolation from Jerusalem, the members of the *Yahad* could not extricate the spiritual significance of Temple from their theology and ritual. The Law which they so desperately tried to honor required animal sacrifices.[29] Yet Moses had also forbidden that these offerings should be made anywhere other than the Jerusalem altar.[30] The *Yahad* would have to find a substitute, and this they achieved by what Gartner describes as a 'transfer of meaning, from the carrying out of blood sacrifice to the living of a life according to the precepts of the Law, thus making a sacrifice of deeds and of lips.'[31] Atonement for the land of Israel would now be effected through the righteousness of the community and through prayer. 1QS states:

> They shall atone for the guilt of transgression and the rebellion of sin, becoming an acceptable sacrifice for the land through the flesh of burnt offerings, the fat of sacrificial portions, and prayer, becoming — as it

[27] 1QM 2:5-6, [Abegg (2005), 149].

[28] Schiffman (1987), 35, notes: 'In the end of days, the priests of the sect would officiate at the Temple, guaranteeing its efficacy and ensuring its utmost purity. Until that day, the sectarians would have to be satisfied with the efficacy of prayer and with the study of texts dealing with the worship and cult of the Temple at which they would neither serve nor offer sacrifice.'

[29] Lev 16.

[30] Dt 12:10-14. For passages in the Qumran scrolls which refer to this prohibition, see IIQT 52.9, 16; 53.1, 9; 56.5; 60.13. Philo attests to the absence of sacrifices among the Essenes, saying that they were 'devout in the service of God, not by offering sacrifices of animals, but by resolving to sanctify their minds.' (*Quod omnis probus liber sit* 75)

[31] Gartner (1965), 21. See also Sanders (1992), 377.

> were — justice itself, a sweet savor of righteousness and blameless behavior, a pleasing free-will offering.[32]

Knohl concludes that 'the Qumran congregation developed fixed prayer arrangements to substitute for the sacrificial service.'[33] Numerous liturgical texts within the Dead Sea scrolls — hymns, prayers, and blessings — attest to the centrality of prayer within their daily rituals.[34] The crossover between prayer and atonement is particularly notable in the document known as *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice* (4Q400) whose songs 'depict the supernatural Temple, in which the angels serve as priests.'[35] The angels do not offer animal sacrifices, but they do follow divinely ordained precepts which bring about expiation of sin, as 4Q400 states:

> He engraved for them [precepts relating to ho]ly gifts; by them, all the everlastingly holy shall sanctify themselves. He shall purify the [luminously] pure [to repa]y all those who render their way crooked. Their expiations shall obtain his goodwill for all those who repent from sin ... knowledge among the priests of the inner Temple, and from their mouth (proceed) the teachings of the holy with the judgements of [his glory] ... his [gra]ces for everlasting merciful forgiveness.[36]

Michael Wise notes that in the late Second Temple Period, many Jews considered the time of the Sabbath sacrifice as a 'divine window of opportunity, a time when prayers were especially effective.'[37] This is the notion behind the *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifices.* It is a collection of prayers and praises to be offered on the Sabbath during the hour of sacrifice. The intent was 'to unite the worshiper with the angels worshiping in heaven.'[38] Joined through prayer and praise with the angelic priests who offer 'expiations on behalf of those who repent,' the members of the *Yahad* considered their participation in this ritual, and all of their prayers, to be a means of atonement.

[32] 1 QS 9:3-5, [Wise,(2005a), 130].

[33] Knohl (1996), 24

[34] Binder (1999), 466, cites the following: hymns (1QH, 11Q5, 4Q400-07, 4Q510-511); prayers (1Q34, 4Q507-509, 4Q503); blessings (1Q28b, 4Q500, 6Q16).

[35] Knohl (1996), 24.

[36] 4Q400 fr. 1 i, [Vermes (2004), 330].

[37] Wise (2005c), 462.

[38] Wise (2005c), 463.

D. Community as Temple

Even as prayer became the new the offering for sin, the community of the faithful became the new Temple. The *avodah* (or worship ritual) of the Jerusalem sanctuary was now fulfilled through the people themselves by means of adherence to the Torah and prayer. 1 QS states:

> When such men as these come to be in Israel, then shall the party of the *Yahad* truly be established, an 'eternal planting,' a temple for Israel, and — mystery! — a Holy of Holies for Aaron; true witnesses to justice, chosen by God's will to atone for the land and to recompense the wicked their due ... they shall be an acceptable sacrifice, atoning for the land and ringing in the verdict against evil, so that perversity ceases to exist.[39]

Just as a transfer of meaning had taken place with regard to animal sacrifices, so the function of the Temple had now been moved from the Jerusalem edifice to the *Yahad* itself. Gartner notes that

> they transferred the whole complex of ideas from the Jerusalem temple to the community. This undoubtedly meant that some measure of 'spiritualization' had taken place, since the idea of the temple was now linked with the community, and since the temple worship was now performed through the community's observance of the Law and through its own liturgy and cultus.[40]

The community was now the place where God's glory would dwell. His eyes were now upon them, and it was by means of their sacrifices of prayer and holiness that relationship could be maintained with Him.

E. Sacred Places

A final illuminating aspect of the *Yahad*'s belief system is their concept of sacred places. The members of the *Yahad* considered themselves to be priests,[41] and the places where they gathered to offer the *sacrifices of prayer* would thus take on an aspect of sanctity. Worshiping in their synagogues,

39 1QS 8:4-7, 9-10, [Wise (2005a), 129].

40 Gartner (1965), 18.

41 CD 3:17-14:4 states: 'God promised them by Ezekiel the prophet, saying, "The priests and the Levites and the sons of Zadok who have kept the courses of My sanctuary when the children of Israel strayed from Me, they shall bring Me fat and blood." "The priests": they are the repentant of Israel, who go out of the land of Judah and the Levites are those accompanying them; "and the sons of Zadok": they are the chosen of

or houses of prayer, these edifices came to share in the sacrality of the Jerusalem Temple. Within these buildings there was no altar, and no animal sacrifices. But they were home to assemblies for ritual prayer, which were opened by the blowing of trumpets, and which followed an obligatory cultic order. In her analysis of CD 11:21-12:1, Annette Stuedel argues: 'The new kind of divine service had the same value as that of the Temple and was equivalent in its form.'[42] The Damascus Document states that

> no one entering a 'house of prostration' shall come, insofar as he is in a state of uncleanness, which demands a washing; and at the sounding of the trumpets of the assembly, he shall have done (it) before or he shall do (it) later, (75), but they shall not interrupt the whole service; [fo]r it is a holy house.[43]

Steudel's analysis highlights the fact that those who participated in the prayer assemblies were required to maintain the same standards of ritual purity as the priests of the Jerusalem Temple. The prayer ritual was a holy convocation, which could not be interrupted. The entrance of an unclean person into the house of prayer would have brought the ritual to a halt. The overall picture, according to Steudel, is that of a replication of the Jerusalem Temple ritual:

> The explicit characterization of the prayer-service as חלכו הדובע clearly means a whole self-contained liturgical procedure, whose course is definitely ruled, and no interruption or disturbance whatever is allowed. It is a holy ritual, as holy as the corresponding ritual once in the Jerusalem Temple, which was at the time defiled, so that the autonomous prayer-services of the Essenes had to replace its cultic functions instead.[44]

The ritualistic gathering place was a replication of the Temple and the sacrifices offered within were prayers.

F. Prayer in Exile

Looking at these aspects of their worldview — atonement, 'community as Temple,' and sacred places — the indispensable role of prayer among

Israel, the ones called by name, who are to appear in the Last Days.' [Wise, (2005b), 54-55] See also 4Qp Isa fragment I.

[42] Steudel (1993), 58.

[43] CD XI,21-XII,1, [Steudel (1993), 66].

[44] Steudel (1993), 65.

the *Yahad* becomes evident. Prayer had become the new sacrifice. Torn away from the Jerusalem Temple, it became 'justice itself,' and a 'pleasing free-will offering.' It was through prayer that the earthly community of priests joined with host of angelic priests who lifted up their offerings in the heavenly Temple. And it was in the spiritualized Temple of the community itself, gathering in their holy houses of prayer, that their sacrifices were presented.

IV. The Pharisees

A. Introduction

The *Yahad* represents an extreme example of separation from the Jerusalem Temple. We must bear in mind, however, that the vast majority of first-century Jews did not reject the Temple in such an outright fashion.[45] This said, many were in the process of reinterpreting its significance as it pertained to their daily religious praxis. One such group was the *hairesis* of the Pharisees.[46] In first-century Palestinian society, the Pharisees played an expansive role in interpreting the application of the

[45] This is to say that the majority of first-century Jews participated in the Temple functions. Nonetheless, the Temple was an object of critique, particularly among the poor. Wright (1996a), 412, notes: 'The poorer classes evidently regarded the Temple as symbolizing the oppression they suffered at the hands of the rich elite ... when the revolutionaries took over the Temple at the start of the war, one of their first acts was to bum the record of debts. The unpopularity of the ruling class at this time is well documented, and the widespread dislike of them meant that the first-century Temple, and particularly the way in which it was being run, came in for regular criticism.'

[46] From the eighteenth through the mid-twentieth century, Pharisaic scholarship as represented by such colossal figures as Wellhausen, Schurer and Jeremias, took a rather expansive view of the Pharisees' role in first-century CE Palestinian society. More recently, the work of Jacob Neusner has led to a deconstruction of the previous paradigm, and a consequently minimalistic framing of the Pharisees and their influence. Contemporary works on the Pharisees generally tend to expound upon Neusner's presuppositions [e.g. Saldarini (1988), and Mason (2000)], or offer counter-points and correctives [e.g. Sanders (1990), (1992)]. But Neusner's role in shaping the current consensus is undeniable [cf. Wright (1992), Saldarini (1992) and Meier (2001)].

In contrast to Neusner, Rivkin (1978), offers a reconstruction which once again asserts that, 'Pharisaism was clearly the Judaism of Jesus' day.' [Rivkin (1978), 276] Despite the cogency of his arguments, however, his work has gained little traction [cf. Neusner (1980) and Wright (1992), 186]. The primary criticism of Rivkin (and many scholars before him) is that he uncritically accepts the historicity of the primary sources (i.e. Paul, the Gospels, Josephus, and the tannaitic literature). Neusner (1980), 864, states: 'The position is built out of essentially unanalyzed sources. The problems of using those sources for historical reconstruction are not systematically and rigorously

Mosaic Law. The written precepts of the Torah, which had been given to an agriculturally-based society, no longer stood as the sole basis of religious authority. The Pharisees were the guardians of an oral tradition that guided the people in a way of Torah-observance suited for an increasingly urban setting. On the coat-tails of this reinterpretation of the Law, came a new understanding of the Temple's role in everyday life. Its symbolic power was no longer confined to the building in Jerusalem. The sanctity of the Temple, and the experience of YHWH's presence, were being extended into the home, the village, the family, and the synagogue. Men and women were no longer relegated to the role of spectators who would merely watch the priests present offerings and recite prayers. Under the instruction of the Pharisees, they too were priests within their own homes and villages. And their prayers increasingly came to be seen as the acceptable offerings that they presented directly to the Lord.

As we begin our analysis of the Pharisees, we will first look at their role within society as the champions of the Oral Torah. We will then proceed to consider how their extension of the Temple's significance into everyday life ultimately gave shape to an increased emphasis on prayer.

B. *The Role of the Pharisees in First-Century Palestine*

A primary contribution of the Pharisees was the development of an authoritative corpus of traditions that would serve to interpret, supplement, and at times override the authority of the Torah. By the first century CE, these traditions had come to be known as the 'Traditions of the Fathers'(*zeken avoth*), the oral element of the 'dual Torah.' Ellis Rivkin

confronted. So for Rivkin, the sources present facts, and the facts define the problem. In my view, the sources themselves constitute the first and principal problem.'

In defense of Rivkin, we find that many of his arguments are founded upon multiple attestations in the sources. For example, Rivkin (1978), 261-276, cites Josephus, Matthew and the Mishnah in support of the notion that the Pharisees sat in the 'seat of Moses' and exercised oversight of certain aspects of the Temple sacrifices. In response to this claim, Neusner (1973), asserts that the absence of a coherent body of Pharisaic laws pertaining to the Temple sacrifice abrogates the possibility of their oversight. Thus, Neusner attempts to negates Rivkin's well-supported position with an argument from silence.

It is not my intention to enter the current 'fray' of Pharisaic studies. The focus of this present work is prayer, and our analysis of the Pharisees, will be limited to their use and understanding of the same. With Rivkin, however, I do espouse certain positions with regard to the Pharisees that are not in vogue with the current consensus. This does not connote an uncritical acceptance of the primary sources, but my methodology does reflect a willingness to 'connect the dots' when the corroboration of the sources allows for a plausible reconstruction.

attributes the increasing influence of these traditions to social changes taking place in Palestine:

> The Pentateuchal system was bogged down in a commitment to immutable laws administered by a priestly class whose power, authority, and privileges were tightly tied to preserving a system built on the joint interests of priests and peasants. It was a system that was not at all geared to fast-paced urbanization and its destructive impact on the individual, loosened from the soil, and dislodged from his rural moorings.[47]

The fundamental problem was that the Pentateuch had been compiled for an agricultural society. With increasing urbanization — characterized by the development of educated and skilled groups such as scribes, artisans, craftsmen and shopkeepers — new interpretations of the Torah were required. It was the Pharisees who became the masters of these new teachings, to such an extent that by the time of Jesus, they were known as those who sat in the 'seat of Moses.'[48]

By means of their traditions and instruction, the Pharisees created an alternate world of ritual, lifestyle and worship that was based on the Torah, but by no means limited to it. This was a needed progression. The hierarchy of the Jerusalem Temple was dominated by the aristocratic Sadducees, who held doctrines that were at odds with the majority of Jews, and who represented (in the eyes of many) compromise with the Roman authorities. Plenary participation in the feasts which took place in Jerusalem — always a challenge for the Diaspora — was becoming difficult even for the Jews of Palestine. The three pilgrimages a year (one lasting two weeks) were designed to coincide with the agricultural seasons, and participation was feasible for those who lived off the land. But for those who engaged in non-agricultural vocations, the pilgrimages represented an increasing challenge. Palestinian society was ripe for an alternative expression of faithfulness to YHWH, and the Pharisees were there to provide it.[49]

[47] Rivkin (1978), 244.

[48] See Mt 23:2. Archeological excavations from a third-century synagogue in Chorazin, Galilee uncovered a large stone chair with the aramaic inscription 'the seat of Moses.' See Yeivin (1993).

[49] It is here necessary to discuss the matter of sources. In the quest to uncover the teaching and societal role of the Pharisees in first-century Palestine, many scholars have been reluctant to acknowledge the value of the Mishnah and the Talmud. While we must recognize that the rabbinic Judaism which emerged in the wake of the Temple's destruction resulted from a fusion of various Jewish parties and traditions — the

C. The Pharisees, the Temple and Prayer

Under the teaching of the Pharisees, the standards of the ritual purity which the Torah had required for the priests in the Temple were extended into new realms. Referring to the ritualistic structure prescribed by the Mishnah, Chilton and Neusner note that,

> The purpose of the system ... is to bring into alignment the moment of sanctification of the village and the life of the home with the moment of sanctification of the Temple on those same occasions of appointed

teaching of the Pharisees figures prominently in these ancient compendia. In the twentieth century, Rivkin was the most passionate and persuasive advocate of this position. Central to his argument is the notion that Mishnah presupposes the existence of a dual Torah: 'The Mishnah is thus a repository exclusively of the teachings of a scholar class. And since these teachings are set forth as authoritative and binding, and since they are teachings which, for the most part, are not written down in the Pentateuch, they testify to a system of authority that is self-assumed, self-asserted, and self-validated.' [Rivkin (1978), 232] In the era of Second Temple Judaism, the Pharisees comprised the only broadly influential group that derived its authority from extra-scriptural sources. The authority of the Sadducees and the priests rested on the Torah. Thus, given the fact that the Mishnah consists of substantial categories of teaching that have minimal or no counterpart in the Pentateuch, it follows that the Mishnah is a continuation of Pharisaic tradition.

Some scholars, however, have cited the paucity of teachings directly ascribed to the Pharisees in the Mishnah. Jacob Neusner has championed the minimalist view, citing that, 'Sages, not Pharisees, are the Mishnah's authorities.' [Neusner (1988), xxxii] Rivkin has addressed this matter by noting that in tannaitic literature, the early term *Pharisee* or *perushim* had been generally replaced with the denotation of *Hakhamim-Soferim*, or 'sages.' He argues that in the tannaitic era, the term *Pharisee* had lost its honorific implications, and was generally limited to instances involving historical disputes with the opposing party of the Sadducees. Apart from these specific incidents, the term is rare. When the *Hakhamim-Soferim* are recognized as the Pharisees, their imprint becomes enormous. Rivkin notes: Scarcely a paragraph of the Mishnah or the Tosefta or the berakoth or the Tannaitic Midrash is without some reference to the *Hakhamim*. Every anonymous *halakhah* that antedates the destruction of the Temple is their handiwork... The Pharisees, once liberated from the limited, circumscribed, and rare usage of *perushim* and identified as the *Hakhamim-Soferim*, can reclaim their identity as that scholar class that created the concept of the twofold Law, carried it to triumphant victory over the Sadducees, and made it operative in society.' [Rivkin (1978), 177-178]

Rivkin's reclamation of the Pharisaic identity in the Mishnah affords us the greatest congruence of the ancient sources. The picture which emerges from the Gospels, the writings of Paul, Josephus and the Mishnah is clear: 'Hitherto discordant sources are now seen to be in agreement. Josephus, Paul, the Gospels, and the Tannaitic Literature are in accord that the Pharisees were the scholar class of the twofold Law.' [Rivkin (1978), 179]

> times. The underlying and generative theory of the system is that the village is the mirror-image of the Temple.[50]

This Pharisaic ordering of life on the basis of the Temple rituals took many forms. It was reflected in their teaching on food and liquids and the vessels which carried them, physical contact with corpses and tombs, their teaching on tithing, the Sabbath, and marriage. Prayer also played an important role in this process.

The historian Josephus noted that prayer figured prominently among the Pharisees' instruction to the masses: 'They are able greatly to persuade the body of the people; and whatsoever they do about divine worship, prayers, and sacrifices, they perform them according to their direction.'[51] The Gospel author Luke makes reference to the fact that the Pharisees were known for their frequent fasting and prayer.[52] Matthew also alludes to the Pharisees and prayer, highlighting what was apparently their custom of praying openly in the synagogues and on street corners.[53]

Although we have no specific texts or prayers which can be categorically ascribed to the Pharisees, indications of their influence are numerous. The primary prayer of the Rabbinic liturgy, the *Teflilah*, bears the fingerprints of the Pharisees. Their imprint is evident particularly in the second petition which affirms the Pharisaic doctrine of the resurrection:

> You are mighty, bringing low the proud; powerful, judging the arrogant; ever-living, raising up the dead; causing the wind to blow and the dew to descend; sustaining the living, quickening the dead. O cause our salvation to sprout as in the twinkling of an eye. You are praised, O Lord, who quickens the dead.[54]

The *Tefillah* was to be prayed three times a day, corresponding to the sacrifices of the Jerusalem Temple.[55] At the time the Temple was stand-

[50] Chilton and Neusner (1995), 32.

[51] *Antiquitates Judaicae* 18:15.

[52] See Lk 18:9-14.

[53] See Mt 6:5.

[54] Petuchowski (1978a), 27.

[55] By the time the Mishnah was recorded in the late second century, the debate among the Rabbis was not about *whether* the pious would pray, but rather how often and according to what structure. *M. Ber.* 4:1 states, 'The morning prayer [may be recited] until midday ... the afternoon prayer [may be recited] until the evening ... And [the prayers] of the additional service [may be recited] at any time during the day.' *M. Ber.*

ing, it is not clear whether the typical Jew believed that prayer served as a substitute for the sacrifices. But these daily rituals of prayer constituted an innovative expression of faith, which many Jews found to be deeply meaningful. In the Temple, they were bystanders and spectators. They may have prayed spontaneously, but these prayers would have served only a secondary function. This was not the case with the daily prayers. As Joseph Heinemann commented:

> Neither the spontaneous prayers of individuals ... nor the cultic prayer-hymns of the Levites are the equivalents of the institution of fixed, communal prayer, which constituted a radical innovation of the Second Temple period, and which made an indelible impress on the entire religious life of the people by providing them with a completely novel form of religious expression. Communal fixed prayer, unlike the Levitical hymns, is a self-sufficient and independent form or worship, and is not a subordinate of, nor a 'accompaniment' to, a more primary ritual or ceremony. It requires neither a holy shrine, nor a priestly 'officiant' cast, which alone is empowered to perform it.[56]

The daily ritual of prayer empowered the individual. It paved 'a new, more intimate and immediate way by which man may approach God and fulfill his divine obligations, anywhere and at any time.'[57] In time, prayer would come to be recognized as a, 'legitimate form of divine worship, on a par with the sacrificial cult of the Temple, through which Israel fulfills its daily communal obligations to the Lord: "Just as the sacrificial cult is called *avodah* so, too, is prayer called *avodah*"'[58]

The manner in which prayer coincided with the broader agenda of the Pharisees is evident. The Torah no longer stood as the sole basis of religious authority. An oral tradition had been established, which made holiness and piety more accessible to members of an increasingly urban, non-agricultural society. The imagery of the Temple was no longer confined to the building in Jerusalem. The home, the village and the family all shared in its sanctity, and the prayers they offered therein were offerings acceptable to the Lord.

4:3 cites Rabban Gamaliel as saying, 'Each day a man should pray the Eighteen [Benedictions].'

[56] Heinemann (1977), 14.

[57] Heinemann (1977), 14.

[58] Heinemann (1977), 14, citing *Sifre on Deuteronomy* 41.

V. The Synagogue

Another milieu that served as an extension of the Temple's sanctity was the local synagogue.[59] Contemporary research on ancient Palestinian synagogues reveals that these buildings were increasingly being seen as physical replications of the Temple. And as a Temple without priests, Torah study and prayer were functioning as the sacrifices offered within.

The periodic gathering of village communities known as the *maamad* played a central role in the historical development of the Palestinian synagogue. Jakob Petuchowski describes how it functioned:

> In the early Second Temple era, local Palestinian synagogues were formed with the purpose that they would operate in conjunction with the Temple rituals. Representatives from Palestinian localities were regularly sent to Jerusalem to 'stand by' while the sacrificial cult took place in the Temple. While these town representatives were witnessing the Temple sacrifice, members of the population would gather at the same times for Scripture reading and prayer.[60]

Thus, the function of the *maamad* was to tether the local community to the Temple. As some village members were physically present in Jerusalem, others would be spiritually present through their prayers.

Initially, these gatherings would have taken place at city gates. Then, in the Hellenistic era they moved into dedicated structures.[61] By the first century CE, synagogue buildings could be found throughout Palestine.

[59] It is not altogether clear whether or not the broad institution of the synagogue in the first century CE could be classified as 'Pharisaic.' It is for this reason that we treat the subject of the synagogue separately. Nonetheless, it will be seen that there is a great congruence between the functions of the synagogue and the overall agenda of the Pharisees. Herford (1962), 88-109; R. M. Grant (1963), 274-275; M. Grant (1973), 41; Rivkin (1978), 103; Gutman, ed. (1981), 4; and Hengel (1981), 57, have all posited that the synagogue stood as an institution dominated by the Pharisees. Representing the opposing view, Levine (1996), 441, claims that 'the Pharisees had little or nothing to do with the early synagogue; there is not one shred of evidence pointing to such a connection. No references associate the early Pharisees (the "Pairs") with the synagogue, and there is nothing in early synagogue liturgy that is particularly Pharisaic.' My position is that the influence of the Pharisees in the synagogue would have been congruent to their considerable influence in society. Against Levine, there is first-century evidence that makes a connection between the Pharisees and the synagogue, namely the Gospel passages of Mt 23:34; Lk 11:43 and Jn 12:42-43. And as mentioned above, the liturgical prayer of the *Amidah* bears the markings of Pharisees.

[60] Petuchowski (1978b), 46. This custom is described in *m. Taanit* 4:2-3.

[61] See Binder (1999), 211.

Some scholars assert that the function of these structures was primarily as a community center, with little religious significance.[62] Archeological evidence from synagogues in both the regions of the Diaspora and Palestine indicate, however, that synagogue buildings were beginning to physically mirror the Jerusalem Temple. Notable features of many first-century structures include the presence of *mikvaot* for ritual bathing prior to entering,[63] architectural designs modeled after the Temple courts,[64] and artistic motifs that modeled the decorations of the Temple.[65]

Another characteristic of the first-century Palestinian synagogue communities was the deliberate exclusion of the priests in the basic functions of the institution. James Burtchaell notes:

> The priesthood had anciently been associated, not simply with sacrificial worship, but with the interpretation of the Torah and with judicial discipline ... Yet in the villages and towns and cities, where priests in plenty dwelt and were available, a totally lay synagogue organization had long since decided it needed no legitimacy which the priests could give.[66]

This exclusion of the priests suggests that Torah interpretation was the domain of the Pharisees. But it also affirms the primary role of the people as those who offer *avodah* to YHWH.

As a Temple without priests, Torah study and prayer were perceived as the sacrifices offered within.[67] Heinemann notes:

[62] Levine (2000), 135-173, contends that the in the typical synagogue of Palestine, the religious functions would have been secondary to the civic activities. He does concede, however, that Diaspora synagogues served more as religious centers, as did certain coastal synagogues in Palestine.

[63] See Binder (1999), 200.

[64] See Strange (1997), 43.

[65] See Binder (1999), 200.

[66] Burtachaell (1992), 254.

[67] Levine (2000), 163-173; Zeitlin (1964), 208-249; Fleischer (1990), 397-425; and Reif (1993), 44-52, 82-87, all assert the institution of communal prayer was a post-70 CE development. Levine (2000), 163 states, 'The case against the existence of institutionalized communal prayer in the Second Temple synagogue rests squarely on the evidence at hand (or lack thereof) for communal Jewish prayer-worship in the pre-70 period.'

What constitutes 'evidence,' however, is determined by one's methodology. It is broadly accepted that in the late first century CE, Rabban Gamaliel and the rabbis of Yavneh edited and organized the extant communal prayer of the *Amidah*. If one asserts that this prayer was a recent innovation at the time of Yavneh, then indeed there is no

> The '*avodah*-through-prayer' of the synagogue (including the reading from Scripture) should be viewed as an entirely new and revolutionary creation ... which has its own characteristic nature — it is prayer which no longer serves as a mere addition to the 'genuine' *avodah* of the sacrifices, but is itself an authentic and self-sufficient form of worship devoid of cultic elements; it is a new style of *avodah* in which the congregation of worshippers becomes the active agent and is able to perform the prayer-ritual by itself, without the need for a priest or other functionary.[68]

Although the institution of the synagogue did not stand in rivalry to the Jerusalem Temple, the symbolic transposition of the Temple's functions onto the synagogue functions made the Temple rituals increasingly redundant, as Haran notes:

> The offering of sacrifices, was supplemented in the temple court by prayer and prostrations. The three acts complemented each other. Serving as constituents of the broader temple complex, in which the idea of the house of God manifested itself. In the period of the Second Temple, however, prayer as an act of worship was also implanted in a distinct institutional framework in the form of a synagogue, which was an entirely new innovation. In the course of time this institution enabled Judaism to do without the Temple altogether.[69]

A final argument attesting to the significance of the synagogue in first-century Palestine is the ease with which Palestinian Judaism survived the destruction of the Temple in 70 CE. In the various expressions of Judaism that emerged in the wake of this great disruption, prayer played a central role in ritual and theology. One would be mistaken to assume that this was an abrupt phenomenon. As Schiffman notes:

evidence for communal prayer prior to 70 CE. We here follow Heinemann (1977), 220, who asserts that communal prayer did, in fact, exist long before 70 CE, in the primitive forms of several of the *Amidah's* benedictions: 'Even if we were to reject some of them, the ones which remain would still sufficiently testify to the existence of various "series" of benedictions and petitions similar to those in the Eighteen Benedictions a full century or two before the destruction of the Temple; hence we are justified in accepting the opinion of the majority of scholars that the first beginnings of the *amidah* preceded this event by hundreds of years.'

[68] Heinemann (1977), 133.

[69] Haran (1988), 21-22.

> In the aftermath of the Great Revolt of 66-74 there was no longer any cult. The priest no longer sacrificed; the Levite no longer sang; Israel no longer made pilgrimages to the holy Temple. Henceforth, only prayer and the life of rabbinic piety could ensure Israel's continued link to its Father in Heaven. It is naïve to assume that this eventuality came upon Pharisaic-rabbinic Judaism with no warning.[70]

Prayer and the use of liturgy were increasing throughout the Second Temple, and the synagogue provided the central impetus for this movement. In this setting, the ritual sacrifices of the Jerusalem Temple and the role of the priesthood were not so much rejected, as they were gradually becoming superfluous.

Having surveyed the landscape Judaism in first-century Palestine, we have seen that the prayer movement taking place among diverse communities was driven by changing attitudes toward the Jerusalem Temple. Some viewed it as a corrupt institution; others saw it as increasingly obsolete; and still other Jews viewed its rituals as superfluous or redundant. Whatever the reason for their sense of isolation, these various communities were giving expression to the historical significance of the Temple in new ways and in new settings. A common theme was that the community itself was the dwelling place of God, and the prayers they lifted up were sacrifices pleasing to Him.

In making these observations, we note that the intention of these communities was not to abolish the ritual of sacrifice. The *Yahad* hoped to see their priests one day restored to the Jerusalem Temple, and the Pharisees gave instruction regarding the Temple sacrifices.[71] Thus, these communities did not look at prayer as something that would supersede the sacrifices. Rather, prayer filled a void left by what they perceived as a deficient institution. Each community, in its own way, envisioned the restoration or purification of the sacrificial system.[72] But as long as the Temple failed to deliver on its promises, prayer would be their way of finding the intimacy with YHWH for which they longed.

[70] Schiffman (1953), 34.

[71] Again, this is according to Josephus, *Antiquitates Judaicae* 18:15.

[72] The Pharisaic vision of the Temple is seen in the Mishnah. Its depiction of the institution is largely an object of fantasy [see Neusner (1988), xvii]. It is a vision cast by the Pharisees (and their heirs) not of what the Temple was, but of what they wanted it to be.

VI. Jesus and the Temple

A. Introduction

Like many of his contemporaries, Jesus' vision of prayer derived from his attitude toward the Temple. He believed that the institution had failed to fulfill its original purpose. His mission was to raise up a new Temple, one in which all nations could gather to experience communion with the Father through prayer.

We note that the Gospel traditions do point to some positive aspects of Jesus' attitude toward the Temple. He participated in its festivals;[73] he taught there frequently;[74] he was willing to pay the tax;[75] and his instruction seemed to presuppose the legitimacy of the Temple cult.[76] Furthermore, it should be noted that the early Christian community did not see any contradiction between their faith in the risen Christ and their continued presence and participation in the life and activities of the Temple.[77] Yet, in spite of these seemingly favorable attitudes, Jesus was scathingly critical of the priestly leaders. His teaching and his ministry ultimately set him on a collision course with the Jerusalem hierarchy, and the Gospel authors unanimously portray his Temple polemic as one of the factors that led to his crucifixion.[78]

The reconciliation of these seemingly contradictory postures toward the Temple lies in the eschatological character of Jesus' preaching and actions. His attitude toward the Temple in no way denied the original legitimacy of the institution. But in his actions and teachings he sought to communicate that the Temple was no longer operating in the best interests of the people, and that the time had come for something better.[79] In the new eschatological era of the kingdom, the Jerusalem Temple would simply be obsolete, for he himself would take its place.

In the effort to establish himself as the rightful successor to the Temple, Jesus engaged in a multi-faceted attack against its system: first, he argued that its sanctity was not inviolable; second, he demonstrated that its sacrifices were not necessary for forgiveness; and finally, he pro-

[73] Lk 2:41-51; Jn 5:1; 7:10.

[74] Mk 14:49.

[75] Mt 17:24-27.

[76] Mt 5:23-24.

[77] See Lk 24:3; Act 2:46; 3:1; 5:42.

[78] See Mt 21:12-13; 26:51; Mk 11:15-18; 14:58; Lk 19:45-46; Jn 2:14-20.

[79] Cf. Wright (1996a), 432-433.

claimed that the current Temple system stood under the judgment of God. We will look at each of these in detail.

B. The Sanctity of the Temple

While Jesus acknowledged the sanctity of the Temple,[80] he also sought to demonstrate that the codes which guarded its holiness could be overridden by a greater authority, namely himself. The synoptic Gospels all tell the story of an encounter between Jesus and the Pharisees, in which Jesus demonstrates that the cultic purity of the Sabbath and the Temple are not predominant in all things.[81]

The account depicts Jesus and his disciples plucking heads of grain on the Sabbath. When challenged by the consternated Pharisees regarding the lawfulness of their actions, Jesus' response addresses not only the sanctity the Sabbath, but that of Temple as well. First, he calls to their attention the story of David, who when hungry had eaten the bread of Presence that was forbidden to all but the priests, thus violating the code of the Tabernacle. Second, Jesus cites another infraction which occurred on a regular basis: the ongoing profanation of the Sabbath by the Temple priests.[82]

In both cases, Jesus argues *a fortiori* that a 'rule' can be broken by an overriding authority. David's consumption of the bread had been justified by the simple fact that he was *David*, a man after God's own heart.[83] The needs of a righteous man trumped the sanctity of the Tabernacle. In the same way, Jesus asserts that the need for daily sacrifice in the Temple also trumps other considerations, and thus the priests are 'guiltless.'[84]

Jesus then goes on (in Matthew's account) to make even more provocative claims: 'I tell you, something greater than the temple is here. And if you had known what this means, "I desire mercy, and not sacri-

[80] Mt 23:17, 21.

[81] Mt 12:1-8; Mk 2:23-28; Lk 6:1-5.

[82] Mt 12:5

[83] 1 Sam 13:14. Wright (1996a), 535, argues that David had the right to override the normal code of practice because he was 'the anointed (but not yet enthroned) king.' I would argue that kingship alone was not an adequate justification for such action, as the account of Saul in 1 Sam 13 demonstrates. David's right standing before God was consistently tied to the uprightness of his heart, as it says in Ps 51: 16-17: 'For you will not delight in sacrifice, or I would give it; you will not be pleased with a burnt offering. The sacrifices of God are a broken spirit; a broken and contrite heart, O God, you will not despise.'

[84] Mt 12:5. Cf. Gundry (1982), 221-225.

fice," then you would not have condemned the guiltless. For the Son of Man is lord of the Sabbath.'(Mt 12:6-8)

Jesus has thus asserted that he is greater than both the Temple and the Sabbath.[85] The basis upon which he claims superiority to these sacred institutions is rooted in the comparison that he makes between himself and David. David was vindicated by his righteousness, and so it is with Jesus. Hosea had declared, 'For I desire steadfast love and not sacrifice, the knowledge of God rather than burnt offerings.'(Hos 6:6) This is what the Pharisees lack. But Jesus has this knowledge, and his authority proceeds from it. He asserts that the traditions of Sabbath and the sacrifices of the Temple are subject to the Son of Man, for it is he who knows that what pleases the Father is mercy, and not sacrifice.

C. *The Temple and Atonement*

A fundamental purpose of the Temple, as prescribed in the Torah, was to provide a system of atonement for the sins of the nation.[86] Without the forgiveness of sin, Israel could not have relationship with her God. It is for this reason that the existence and the identity of the nation emanated from the Temple, as Jacob Neusner notes, 'The Torah made (the) Temple the pivot and focus ... The life of Israel flowed from the altar; what made Israel *Israel* was the center, the altar.'[87] The Temple was the *exemplary center*, the reality upon which all reality was modeled.[88]

[85] His line of reasoning is that if he trumps the Temple, and the Temple trumps the Sabbath, then he is Lord of the Sabbath. Corollary to these claims is his assertion that his disciples are 'guiltless' just as the priests of the Temple are 'guiltless.' The offense of the priests is overridden by the greatness of the Temple, just as the offense of the disciples is overridden by the greatness of Jesus.

[86] See Lev 16.

[87] Cited by Dunn (2006), 46.

[88] Such a perspective finds attestation in the Mishnah, where the universe is portrayed as a configuration of concentric circles. *M. Kelim* 1:6-9 states: 'There are ten [degrees of] holiness(es): The land of Israel is holier than all lands...The cities surrounded by a wall are more holy than it [the land]... Within the wall [of Jerusalem] is more holy than they ... The Temple mount is more holy than it. The rampart is more holy than it. The court of women is more holy than it... The court of Israel is more holy than it. The court of the priests is more holy than it... [The area] between the porch and the altar is more holy than it. The sanctuary is more holy than it. The Holy of Holies is more holy than they.' See also: Jub. 8.19, which states that Mount Zion is situated, 'in the midst of the navel of the earth;' and Sib. Or. 5.248-250, which describes the Jewish people as 'the divine and heavenly race of the blessed Jews, who live around the city of God in the middle of the earth.'

If Jesus intended to somehow present the Temple as being redundant and obsolete, then it was incumbent upon him to demonstrate that the Temple's system of sacrifice was no longer necessary for the forgiveness of sin. James Dunn cites the events portrayed in Mk 2:1-12 as emblematic of Jesus' strategy in this regard, and indicative of the response he typically elicited.[89] In this passage (which describes the healing of the paralytic lowered through the roof), Jesus asserts his authority to forgive sins, against the protests of the Scribes and Pharisees who claim that no one can forgive sins but God alone. Dunn interprets Jesus' words and actions in this pericope as a fundamental challenge to the Temple:

> He pronounced the man's sins forgiven outside the cult and without any reference (even by implication) to the cult. It was not so much that he usurped the role of God in announcing sins forgiven. It was rather that he usurped the role of God which God had assigned to priest and cult ... He who took upon himself the priestly task of pronouncing absolution, without the authorization of the Temple authorities and without reference to the cult, might well be seen as putting a question mark against the importance and even the necessity of the cult, and, more threateningly, as undermining the authority of those whose power rested upon that system.[90]

Jesus thus proclaimed that the forgiveness of sins was rooted in his identity and authority rather than in the cultic ritual.[91] He himself would replace the Temple.

The implications of this claim are further amplified when we once again consider the symbolic significance of the Temple. Carol Meyers notes:

> The Temple in conception was a dwelling place on earth for the deity of ancient Israel. The symbolic nature of the Jerusalem Temple ... depended upon a series of features that, taken together, established the sacred precinct as being located at the cosmic center of the universe, at the place where heaven and earth converge and thus from where God's control over the universe is effected.[92]

[89] Parallels: Mt 9:2-9; Lk 5:17-26.

[90] Dunn (2006), 61-62.

[91] Mk 2:11.

[92] Cited by Wright (1996a), 407.

When Jesus stated that the authority to forgive sin resided in his own identity, and not in the authority of the Temple ritual, he was in essence proclaiming himself to be the center of the cosmos, the convergence point of heaven and earth, and the locus of divine control over the universe. There could not be two centers. Consequently, the Jerusalem Temple of his day, and all that it represented, stood as a fundamental rival to his claim.[93] It thus comes as no surprise that Jesus prophesied the imminent judgment of the Father upon that system which he had come to replace.

D. *The Temple and the Judgment of God*

Jesus was remembered by both friend and foe alike as declaring that the Jerusalem structure would be destroyed, and that he would rebuild the true Temple of his body in three days.[94] Jesus predicted that the Jerusalem Temple would fall,[95] and this became the pivotal point of his prophetic ministry. Wright argues that, 'As a prophet, Jesus staked his reputation on his prediction of the Temple's fall within a generation; if and when it fell, he would thereby be vindicated.'[96]

It is in this same light that Jesus' cleansing of the Temple[97] should not be seen as merely a purification,[98] but rather as a symbolic act of divine judgment upon it.[99] Gartner characterizes the significance of his actions saying:

> They express the idea that Jesus qua Messiah now had the authority to demonstrate, in word and deed, that the time had come for the establishment of the 'new' temple and a new and better basis of fellowship with God ... the cleansing of the temple was to Jesus a way of showing what the 'house of God' was to be in the last days: a house of prayer, a house in which the true fellowship with God could be found.[100]

93 Wright (1996a), 436, remarks, 'It is not surprising, therefore, that when Jesus came to Jerusalem the place was not, so to speak, big enough for both him and the Temple together.'

94 See Mk 14.58; 15.29-30; Mt 26.61; Mt 27.39-40; Jn 2.19-21; GTh 7.

95 See Mk 14, Mt 24; Lk 21.

96 Wright (1996a), 362.

97 See Mt 21:12-13; Lk 19:45-46; Mk 11:15-17; Jn 2:14-16.

98 As it characterized by Dunn (2006), 64.

99 See Wright (1996a), 416-424, and Gartner (1965), 110.

100 Gartner (1965), 107.

As he drove out the money changers, Jesus said, 'It is written, "My house shall be called a house of prayer," but you make it a den of robbers.' (Mt 21:13) An analysis of the texts which Jesus' quoted in the midst of this episode further amplifies this point. The notion of the Temple a 'house of prayer for all nations' comes from Isaiah 56:6-7 which declares:

> And the foreigners who join themselves to the Lord, to minister to him, to love the name of the Lord, and to be his servants, everyone who keeps the Sabbath and does not profane it, and holds fast my covenant — these I will bring to my holy mountain, and make them joyful in my house of prayer; their burnt offerings and their sacrifices will be accepted on my altar; for my house shall be called a house of prayer for all peoples.

The idea of the 'den of robbers' is from Jeremiah 7:9-15, (which is important here to cite in full):

> Will you steal, murder, commit adultery, swear falsely, make offerings to Baal, and go after other gods that you have not known, and then come and stand before me in this house, which is called by my name, and say, 'We are delivered!' — only to go on doing all these abominations? Has this house, which is called by my name, become a den of robbers in your eyes? Behold, I myself have seen it, declares the LORD. Go now to my place that was in Shiloh, where I made my name dwell at first, and see what I did to it because of the evil of my people Israel. And now, because you have done all these things, declares the LORD, and when I spoke to you persistently you did not listen, and when I called you, you did not answer, therefore I will do to the house that is called by my name, and in which you trust, and to the place that I gave to you and to your fathers, as I did to Shiloh. And I will cast you out of my sight, as I cast out all your kinsmen, all the offspring of Ephraim.

These passages, cited in tandem, form the basis of a devastating and radical statement. Jesus is proclaiming that the Jerusalem Temple is under judgment. The full weight of Jeremiah's condemnation is expressed toward his own generation. Those who offer the sacrifices are thieves, murderers and idolaters. The Temple has failed to serve its function, and there is no hope for its redemption. YHWH will judge it as He judged Shiloh. In its place He will establish the eschatological Temple of which Isaiah spoke. Jesus claimed that this new Temple would be nothing other than his own body. He himself would be the fulfillment of what the Temple was supposed to be.

E. The New Temple

In the proclamation of Jesus, the sanctity of the Jerusalem Temple was not inviolable; its sacrifices were not necessary for forgiveness; and it stood under the judgment of God. In anticipation of the wreckage and ruin of a failed institution, Jesus proclaimed himself to be the fulfillment of all that the Temple had once promised. He embodied true sanctity; he offered true forgiveness; and the new Temple would be his body.

Jesus appropriated for himself the Isaianic notion of the Temple as a 'house of prayer.' He declared himself to be the medium through which the burnt offerings and sacrifices of all nations would be accepted by God. By casting himself as the new Temple, and declaring that this would be 'a house of prayer,' Jesus made prayer the centerpiece of the *avodah* that he was introducing. In the Temple of his body, prayer would be the offering and the sacrifice accepted on God's altar.[101]

VII. Conclusion

Jesus lived during an age of diachronic innovation. He and many others were casting new interpretations for many of Judaism's central icons — the Temple, the sacrifices, and the priesthood — paving the way for radically new expressions of the faith. The significance of the Temple, in particular, was being dramatically reconfigured. Its meaning was beginning to transcend the literal building and the rituals which took place therein. Whether or not the Temple had a *material existence* was becoming less-and-less important. It was the *symbol* that mattered. All that the Temple represented was being expressed in new settings: the home, the village, and the synagogue. In this new paradigm, prayer was being presented as the centerpiece of worship. It was a new form of sacrifice, a new way to experience intimacy with YHWH.

The proclamation of Jesus placed him firmly in the company of other first-century innovators. His movement, the *Yahad*, the Pharisees

[101] There is no record of Jesus ever teaching that prayer was an exact substitute for animal sacrifice. The only 'sacrifices' of which Jesus ever explicitly spoke were those of showing mercy, loving God with all of the heart, understanding and strength, and loving one's neighbor as oneself. See Mt 9:7; 12:13 and Mk 12:33.

In the later development of Christian dogma, it would be the death of Christ himself that took the place of animal sacrifices. For instance, in the book of Hebrews, a document that bears remarkable resemblance to the *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifices*, Jesus is presented as the high priest who enters the heavenly Temple to offer the sacrifice of his own body (e.g. Heb 4:11-12).

and the synagogue congregations of Palestine were unified by various characteristics. They all shared a sense of isolation from the Jerusalem Temple; they all created new symbols to replicate the Temple; they all de-emphasized or replaced the role of the traditional priesthood; and they all embraced the notion of prayer as a form of sacrifice.

With regard to the Temple, the views of Jesus and his followers were most closely aligned with the *Yahad*. Both groups held the conviction that the Jerusalem system had become polluted, corrupt, and beyond remedy in its current condition. Both groups conceptualized a replacement for the Temple. For the *Yahad*, it was the community itself,[102] and for Jesus, the Temple was replaced by the symbol of his own body.[103]

Jesus' attitude toward the Temple also bore a certain resemblance to that found among the Pharisees and the synagogues. All were developing a theology and praxis that would ultimately render the Temple redundant. The Pharisees accomplished this by means of extending the sanctity of the Temple into the home and village. The local synagogues were increasingly viewing themselves as small replicas of the Temple. And Jesus, by asserting the authority to forgive sins apart from the Temple cultus, made the sacrifice of animals unnecessary.

As the symbolic significance of the Temple was being replicated and extended into new settings, common Jews were increasingly seeing themselves as priests. For the *Yahad*, the 'repentant of Israel' were the new priesthood. For the Pharisees, the purity rituals observed in the homes were the same practiced by the priests in the Temple. And the followers of Jesus, working on behalf of one who was greater than the Temple, also attained the status of priests.[104]

The final, and most important aspect of similitude between Jesus and his fellow first-century innovators was that they all saw prayer as a way of experiencing intimacy with YHWH apart from the sacrificial

[102] 1QS 9:5-6 states, 'At that moment the men of the Community shall set apart a holy house for Aaron, in order to form a most holy community, and a house of the Community for Israel, those who walk in perfection.' [García Martínez & Tigchelaar (1997-1998), 91]

[103] The body of Jesus subsequently came to be understood as ***both*** his crucified flesh and the community of his followers, e.g. Eph 2: 19-21: 'So then you are no longer strangers and aliens, but you are fellow citizens with the saints and members of the household of God, built on the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Christ Jesus himself being the cornerstone, in whom the whole structure, being joined together, grows into a holy Temple in the Lord. In him you also are being built together into a dwelling place for God by the Spirit.'

[104] Mt 12:5.

ritual. Prayer brought all that the Temple represented into the community gathering. It was becoming the new *avodah* of the Jewish people.

Even as there were many affinities between Jesus and his fellow innovators, there was one aspect of his proclamation that would set him radically apart. This was the claim that he was the true Temple, the house within which all nations would pray. This notion exceeded the interpretive 'boundaries' within which many of his fellow Jews were willing to move.[105] Thus, even though they shared with Jesus a desire to transform the meaning of the symbols, they could not accept his claim to *be* the new symbol.

Jesus claimed to be the one mediator through whom his followers must pray. He also presented himself as the one instructor who would teach them *how* to pray. The prayer which he taught his disciples has come to be known as the Lord's Prayer, i.e. *the prayer of Jesus.* As we now begin to explore what this prayer meant upon his lips, and how it was interpreted by his early followers, we bear in mind that prayer it was a prayer bound up in his own person. The invitation to pray *his* prayer, *his* way, with *his* followers was an invitation to experience the Father *through him.*

[105] Jesus' claims stood in sharp contrast to their broader, more *democratized* approach. For them, the Temple was reflected through the gathered community. Consequently, Jewish prayers from the first century and beyond developed as products of the community. While individual rabbis would eventually 'canonize' certain prayers, the development of Jewish prayer was a phenomenon rooted in community life, and not the instruction of any individual. See Heinemann (1977), Hoffman (1979), Zahavy (1990).

CHAPTER TWO: THE LORD'S PRAYER AND THE DEUTERONOMIC COVENANT

I. Introduction

The people of ancient Israel saw themselves as characters in a story, and the meta-narrative of their experience was often recounted in prayer. Jewish prayers reflected upon the past, articulated the challenges of the present, and cast a vision for the future. The following text from the War Scroll is emblematic of period prayer:

> [Thou art] the God of our fathers; we bless Thy Name for ever. We are the people of Thine [inheritance]; Thou didst make a Covenant with our fathers, and wilt establish it with their children throughout eternal ages. And in all Thy glorious testimonies there has been a reminder of Thy mercies among us to succour the remnant, the survivors of Thy Covenant, that they might [recount] Thy works of truth and the judgements of Thy marvellous mighty deeds. Thou hast created us for Thyself, [O God], that we may be an everlasting people.[1]

It is seen in this text, and many others, that Jewish prayer was not merely a recitation of doctrine, nor solely petition for present needs. It was a means by which the people of Israel affirmed YHWH's sovereignty over their history, and one of the primary mechanisms by which they believed His purposes for the nation would be brought to fulfillment.

As a prayer that was first spoken by the Jewish man Jesus, the LP must also be interpreted in this light. Its original meaning was embed-

[1] 1QM 13, [Vermes (2004), 179].

ded in the meta-narrative of Israel.[2] In order to understand what the LP meant to Jesus and his followers, we must consider how he understood this meta-narrative, and what role he believed his own life and teaching would play in its unfolding.

The Jews of Jesus' time believed that their God had made a covenant with the nation of Israel. As articulated in the book of Deuteronomy, this covenant affirmed the universality of YHWH and the particularity of His chosen people. If Israel would honor the statues and commands set forth by Moses, then she would be exalted among all the nations, and YHWH would be honored throughout the earth. If she failed to keep the Covenant, she would be cursed and brought low.[3]

Many prayers of Jesus' day confessed Israel's failure to honor the pact, and mourned her consequent exile among the nations.[4] In the prayer which Jesus taught to his disciples, however, Israel's failure to honor that Covenant is no longer lamented. The proclamation of Jesus was that the time of the people's exile had come to an end. He was the personification of Israel; the one who would obey the Covenant on her behalf. The message of the LP is that through him, the time of Covenant fulfillment has come. As his followers would speak this prayer, Israel would take her rightful place of honor among the nations, and YHWH would be universally acknowledged as the one true God. The LP was given to his followers as a means by which they could take part in that act of fulfill-

2 The narrative-theological approach to the LP has not been prominent in modern scholarship. For example, Scott (1958), Lohmeyer (1965), Laymon (1968), Brown (1968), Jeremias (1978), Ayo (1992) and Crossan (2010) all construct their interpretation of the prayer utilizing (almost exclusively) the historical-critical method of exegesis.

3 See Dt 28.

4 e.g., these notions are expressed in petitions 5-8 &10 of the *Amidah*: 'Turn us back to You, O Lord, and we shall return; renew our days as of old ... Forgive us, our Father, for we have sinned against You. Blot out and remove our transgressions from before Your sight, for Your mercies are manifold ... Look at our affliction, and champion our cause, and redeem us for the sake of Your Name ... Heal us, O Lord our God, of the pain of our hearts. Remove from us grief and sighing, and bring healing for our wounds ... Hasten the year of our redemptive End ... Sound the great horn for our freedom, and lift up a banner to gather in our exiles. You are praised, O Lord, who gathers in the outcasts of His people Israel.' [Petuchowski (1978a), 28] As we have noted in the first chapter, the general form of this prayer may not have been standardized in the first century, its origins date back centuries earlier. Hoffman (1979), 24, notes: 'Insofar as we understand the term tefillah as a generic description of a particular form, that is to say, a series of blessings, largely petitionary, following upon the credal affirmation of the shema, we may postulate a period of prior development, a gestation period in a sense, in which different orders of blessings were in circulation. Some scholars see this earlier manifestation of a tefillah going back as far as the second or third century BCE.'

ment, and thus guarantee the continuation of all that he had come to establish. It was the prayer of a new Israel.

Our present endeavor is to explore how the themes of the Deuteronomic Covenant are expressed through Jesus' presentation of the LP. We will begin with a brief survey of the Covenant's history and it function within the identity formation of Israel, particularly as it relates to the notions of *universality* and *particularity*. We shall then review various texts which reveal the historical preponderance of these themes in ancient Jewish thought and prayer. With these foundations in place, we will consider how Jesus viewed his own life and ministry in light of this pact. And finally, we will analyze how the LP articulates its continuation and fulfillment.

II. The History of the Covenant

The Pentateuch tells the story of the Covenant from the time of Abraham to Moses. The promise to Abraham, the father of Israel, was that through his seed all families of the earth would be blessed.[5] After spending four hundred years as captives in Egypt, Israel passed through the Sinai wilderness en route to Canaan. At that time, YHWH expanded upon the covenant that He had made with Abraham. He promised them that if they would honor the commandments given to them, then they would be his 'own possession among all the peoples,' and 'a kingdom of priests and a holy nation.' (Ex 19:5-6)

The first generation of Jews departing from Egypt failed to honor this pact. Despite the miracles that they had witnessed and the manna that they had received, they tested and doubted YHWH as they passed through the desert. Hence, they were forbidden from entering the Promised Land. After forty years of wandering, Moses delivered a series of discourses which became known as the book of Deuteronomy. This was the reinstitution of Israel's Covenant. Moses declared, 'Hear, O Israel: The Lord our God, the Lord is one ... you are a people holy to the Lord your God. The Lord your God has chosen you to be a people for his treasured possession, out of all the peoples who are on the face of the earth.' (Dt 6:4, 7) If Israel would honor the statutes and commands given to her by Moses, then she would see the fulfillment of all that YHWH had promised to Abraham. They would be a model peo-

[5] See Gen 12:2-3; 22:17-18.

ple. All the nations of the earth would know that YHWH was the one true God and that Israel was His chosen people:

> And if you faithfully obey the voice of the Lord your God, being careful to do all his commandments that I command you today, the Lord your God will set you high above all the nations of the earth ... And all the peoples of the earth shall see that you are called by the name of the Lord, and they shall be afraid of you. (Dt 28:1, 10)

The ensuing narrative, spanning the era of the Judges all the way to the exile, tells the story of Israel's collective failure to honor her end of the bargain. Figures such as Daniel and Nehemiah explicitly confessed Israel's failure to honor the Covenant.[6] Nonetheless, many Jews throughout the centuries maintained a clear sense of their identity as the chosen people. And despite the humiliations that they suffered at the hand of other nations, they would not abandon the notion that their God was the one true God.

III. Universality and Particularity

A. Israel's Self-Understanding

The book of Deuteronomy left an indelible mark on the self-identification of the Jewish people. Terrence Donaldson comments:

> On one hand, Jews understood their God to be the one, universal deity, a God who had created the whole world and who continued to exercise sovereignty over the created order and all the nations within it. On the other, Jews believed that this God had chosen them out of all the nations of the world to be a special people, that the will and the ways of this God had been revealed uniquely in Israel's scripture, that the God who had created the cosmos was nevertheless uniquely present in the Jerusalem temple, and that despite the Jews' temporal misfortunes, eventually Israel would be vindicated and exalted to a position of preeminence over all other nations.[7]

The command from Moses was that Israel must not acknowledge the existence of any other gods. He declared YHWH to be the only God

[6] See Dan 9; Neh 1:4-11.

[7] Donaldson (2007), 17-18.

and Israel as the one nation, from among all the nations on earth, to whom He had chosen to reveal Himself. This claim to be the one nation chosen by the one true God expresses a foundational element of Israel's self-identification, namely, *particularity*. But this peculiar people also had a purpose in the world: they believed that through them, YHWH would reveal Himself to the nations. This mission of inclusivity, wherein all peoples would acknowledge the supremacy of their God, is another foundational element of Israel's self-identification: *universality*.

The expression of *universality and particularity* within Israel's self-identification was not limited to one group or one era of the nation's history. Rather, this motif is broadly attested throughout the whole of ancient Jewish literature.[8] It is in the historical development of these themes that we find what Jesus considered to be the 'back story' of his own life and ministry. He saw his own mission as a continuation of the Deuteronomic narrative. If we are to understand the LP as a prayer of Covenant fulfillment — wherein Israel embraces its calling to universality and particularity — then we must understand how these themes were articulated in the literature of ancient Israel. I here present a brief survey of select passages, from a diversity of texts that speak of these themes.[9]

B. The Psalms

The supremacy of YHWH and the prediction that all nations will acknowledge Him are ideas proclaimed throughout the Psalms.[10] These texts are also replete with the theme of Israel's unique status as the

[8] Donaldson (2007), 529, notes that with regard to patterns of universalism, 'we are dealing with a phenomenon for which the singular (Judaism) continues to be more appropriate than the plural (Judaisms). Still, the diversity to which the plural draws our attention is amply demonstrated by the range of Jewish attitudes towards the non-Jewish other and the patterns of universalism that are readily apparent.' Donaldson (2007), 517, argues that contrary to the earlier assertions of scholars such as Davies, Jeremias and Munck, 'there is no reason to believe that by the later Second Temple period traditional expectations of an eschatological pilgrimage of the nations to Zion had attenuated and Jewish attitudes concerning the place of Gentiles in Israel's end-time restoration had become much more negative.' He cites passages such as *t. Ber.* 6.2 and *Mekilta Shirata* 8 as evidence that even into the tannaitic period, the ultimate salvation of the Gentiles was a continued expectation.

[9] Many of the texts cited in this section were identified by Donaldson (2007).

[10] e.g. Ps 22:27-28; 46:10; 67:1-5; 72:11; 82:8; 86:8-9; 102:15; 117.

chosen people.[11] The intertwining of these notions is seen clearly in Ps 98:2-3:

> The Lord has made known his salvation; he has revealed his righteousness in the sight of the nations. He has remembered his steadfast love and faithfulness to the house of Israel. All the ends of the earth have seen the salvation of our God.

The nations shall praise the God of Israel when they see His works of power among His chosen people.

C. *The Prophets*

Even as Israel lived for centuries under the dominion of other nations, the prophets proclaimed that she would someday be restored and exalted. At that time, her enemies would be defeated, the twelve tribes would be re-gathered, the Temple would be made glorious, the people would be purified, and many nations would recognize the supremacy of her God as they would come to worship in Jerusalem.[12] A particularly illuminating example of these themes is found in Isaiah, who declared:

> the mountain of the house of the Lord shall be established as the highest of the mountains, and shall be lifted up above the hills; and all the nations shall flow to it, and many peoples shall come, and say: 'Come, let us go up to the mountain of the Lord, to the house of the God of Jacob, that he may teach us his ways and that we may walk in his paths' (Isa 2:2-3).[13]

Isaiah also spoke of a servant, who would not only re-gather the tribes of Israel, but whom YHWH would raise up as a 'light for the nations, that my salvation may reach to the end of the earth.' (Isa 49:6) God promised them, 'nations shall come to your light, and kings to the brightness of your rising.' (Isa 60:3) Jews would be sought out by Gentiles, who would

[11] e.g. Ps 106:4-5; 111:6; 114:2; 135:4; 147:12-20.

[12] e.g., Isa 2:2-4; 9:2-10; 49:5-6; 60:1-3; 66:10-21; Mal 4:1-5; Zech 8:21-22. On the defeat of Israel's enemies, see: Isa 29:8; Jer 30: 11, 16; Joel 3:9-21. On the restoration of Jerusalem, see: Jer 31:23, 38-40; Ez 17:22-24; 40:1-48; Zech 8:1-23; 14:10-11, 20-21. On the establishment of YHWH's rule, see Isa 24:23; 52:7; Ezek 20:33; 34:11-16; 43:7; Mic 4:6-7; Zech 14:8-11. On the return of the exiles, see: Isa 35; Jer 31:1-25; Ez 20:33-44; Zech 8:7-8, 20-23. On the abundance of Israel, see: Isa 25:6-10a; 30:23; 35:5-7; 61:6; Jer 31:12; Joel 2:26; Amos 9:13-15.

[13] Also Mic 4:1-2.

see Israel's exaltation and long to be taught her laws: 'Men from the nations of every tongue shall take hold of the robe of a Jew, saying, "Let us go with you, for we have heard that God is with you."' (Zech 8:22)

D. *The Septuagint and the Apocrypha*

There are passages in the Septuagint that, by means of their translation from Hebrew to Greek, reveal a unique consciousness of Israel's identity as a chosen people, and the eschatological hope that salvation would spread to the nations. Amos 9:11-12 is a particularly significant passage insomuch that it is used in Acts to support the Gentile mission:[14]

> On that day I will raise up the tabernacle of David, that has fallen, and I will rebuild its ruins. And that which has been torn to the ground I will raise up. And I will rebuild it as in the ancient days, in order that the remnant of mankind may seek me, all the nations upon whom my name has been called, says the Lord God, the one who does these things.[15]

We note that in the comparison of LXX and the Hebrew texts:

- The Hebrew text of Amos 9:12a reads: 'that they may possess the remnant of Edom and all the nations who are called by my name.'[16]
- This same phrase in the LXX says, 'in order that the remnant of mankind may seek me, all the nations upon whom my name has been called.'[17]

The original Hebrew text speaks of Israel being restored to greatness, and subsequently taking possession of Edom and the nations. The Septuagint translators, however, expand the notion of Israel's restoration. There, Israel does not *take possession* of the nations. Rather, the nations 'witness the restoration of Israel and are moved by it to seek Israel's God.'[18] It is not by an act of force that the nations come, but rather in response to Israel's exaltation.

[14] See Act 15:16-17.

[15] Translation from the LXX my own.

[16] לְמַ֨עַן יִ֠ירְשׁוּ אֶת־שְׁאֵרִ֤ית אֱדוֹם֙ וְכָל־הַגּוֹיִ֔ם אֲשֶׁר־נִקְרָ֥א שְׁמִ֖י

[17] ὅπως ἐκζητήσωσιν οἱ κατάλοιποι τῶν ἀνθρώπων καὶ πάντα τὰ ἔθνη, ἐφ οὓς ἐπικέκληται τὸ ὄνομά μου ἐπ αὐτούς.

[18] Donaldson (2007), 22.

The Apocrypha also contain passages that express these same themes of *universality* and *particularity*.[19] Tobit 14:5-7 is particularly explicit:

> And afterward they shall return from all places of their captivity, and build up Jerusalem gloriously, and the house of God shall be built in it for ever with a glorious building, as the prophets have spoken thereof. And all nations shall turn, and fear the Lord God truly, and shall bury their idols. So shall all nations praise the Lord, and his people shall confess God, and the Lord shall exalt his people; and all those which love the Lord God in truth and justice shall rejoice, shewing mercy to our brethren.

E. The Pseudepigrapha

In the Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs, it is the restoration and purification of Israel that makes salvation possible for the Gentiles.[20] The book of Enoch envisions a coming 'Son of Man' of whom it is said:

> He will become a staff for the righteous ones in order that they may lean on him and not fall. He is the light of the gentiles and he will become the hope of those who are sick in their hearts. All those who dwell upon the earth shall fall and worship before him; they shall glorify, bless and sing the name of the Lord of the Spirits. For this purpose he became the Chosen one.[21]

The Sibylline Oracles envisioned a time when, 'the people of the great God will again be strong who will be guides in life for all mortals.'[22] The nations will declare:

> Come, let us all fall on the ground and entreat the immortal king, the great eternal God. Let us send to the Temple, since he alone is sovereign and let us all ponder the Law of the Most High God, who is most right-

[19] e.g., Tob 13:11; Wis 1:1-2; 6:9-11. 2 Maccabees expresses the notion that when Israel is restored, 'the nations will know that you are our God.' (2 Mac 1: 27) But there is no indication of salvation. The entire book of the Wisdom of Solomon displays what John Collins (as cited by Dondaldson [2007], 79), refers to as a 'tension between universalism and particularism.' Yet in the judgment of Donaldson (2007), 68, the author's inclination is more toward the latter. Salvation is viewed more as 'embracing a way of life that can be described as ethical monotheism,' and there is no certainty that this will occur.

[20] e.g., T. Levi 18:2-4 (purification of the priesthood); T. Jud. 23:5 (the return from exile); T. Naph. 8:2; T Benj. 11:2 (the salvation of Israel).

[21] 1 En. 48:4-6. See also 1 En. 50:2-5.

[22] Sib. Or. 3:194-195.

eous of all throughout the earth. But we had wandered from the path of the Immortal. With mindless spirit we revered things made by hand, idols and statues of dead men.[23]

4 Ezra 6:25-26, states that after the restoration of Israel, 'the heart of the earth's inhabitants shall be changed and converted to a different spirit.' Ps Sol 17:30-32 tells of the Messiah:

> And he will have gentile nations serving him under his yoke, and he will glorify the Lord in (a place) prominent (above) the whole earth. And he will purge Jerusalem(and make it) holy as it was even from the beginning, (for) nations to come from the ends of the earth to see his glory, to bring as gifts her children who had been driven out, and to see the glory of the Lord with which God has glorified her. And he will be a righteous king over them, taught by God. There will be no unrighteousness among them in his days, for all shall be holy, and their king shall be the Lord Messiah.

F. Philo

Philo claimed that the Mosaic Law was highly esteemed among Gentiles.[24] He reasoned that if the Jews commanded such respect even as their nation languished, then surely the restoration of Israel would lead to a large-scale conversion among the Gentiles:

> Thus the laws are shewn to be desirable and precious in the eyes of all, ordinary citizens and rulers alike, and that too though our nation has not prospered for many a year. It is but natural that when people are not flourishing their belongings to some degree are under a cloud. But, if a fresh start should be made to brighter prospects, how great a change for the better might we expect to see! I believe that each nation would abandon its peculiar ways, and, throwing overboard their ancestral customs, turn to honouring our laws alone. For, when the brightness of their shining is accompanied by national prosperity, it will darken the light of the others as the risen sun darkens the stars.[25]

[23] Sib. Or. 3:716-723. See also Sib. Or. 3:556-573; 3:624-631; 3:710-723; 3:732-733; 3:762-775; 5:420-428.

[24] *De vita Mosis* 2:25-27.

[25] *De vita Mosis* 2:43-44.

G. *The Dead Sea Scrolls*

The notion that the *Yahad* is a chosen remnant of YHWH is predominant throughout the DSS.[26] Judgment upon the sinners of all nations is also a consistent theme,[27] and at times the texts display a tone of hostility towards foreigners.[28] Nonetheless, there are many texts found at Qumran that speak of the salvation of the Gentiles, which will occur as the nations witness the blessing and restoration of Israel.[29] The following are examples:

> your re[si]dence [...] a place of rest in Jerusa[lem the city which] you [cho]se from the whole earth for [your Name] to be there for ever. For you loved Israel more than all the peoples... And all the countries (הגוים) have seen your glory, for you have made yourself holy in the midst of your people, Israel. And to your great Name they will carry their offerings: silver, gold, precious stones, with all the treasures of their country, to honour your people and Zion, your holy city and your wonderful house.[30]

> Thou wilt raise up survivors among Thy people and a remnant within Thine inheritance. Thou wilt purify and cleanse them of their sin for all their deeds are in Thy truth. Thou wilt judge them in Thy great lovingkindness and in the multitude of Thy mercies and in the abundance of Thy pardon, teaching them according to Thy word; and Thou wilt

[26] e.g., 1QS 8:5-10; CD 2:3-12; 4Q266 frag. 11:9-13; 1QM 10:8-11; 13:7-18; 14:8-10; 18:6-11; 1QHa 8:18-21; 4Q504 frags. 1-2 ii-iii; 1Q34 1-2; 1QSb; 4Q418 frag. 81.

[27] e.g., 1QM 1:1-7; 11:13-18; 12:10-18; 14:7; 15:1-2; 19:3-8; 1QHa 11:26-36; 14:29-33.

[28] Some scholars have questioned whether the *Yahad* believed in the ultimate salvation of the Gentiles. Roland Deines [cited by Donaldson (2007), 213] argues that the Qumran community would have been obligated to reconcile Scripture passages speaking of universal salvation (e.g. Isaiah) with its own particularistic tendencies. This would have been accomplished through a two-stage eschatological paradigm. In the present age, the remnant of Israel must separate itself in order to be fully purified and restored. At a later second stage, Deines argues, some Gentiles would make pilgrimage to Israel to be saved.

[29] The fact that a text has been found among the DSS does not necessarily indicate that its provenance is with the *Yahad*. For example, Chazon (1997) argues that Q504 *The Words of the Luminaries* is most likely not of Qumranic origin. Our purpose in this section, however, is not to analyze the specific beliefs of the *Yahad* — but rather to demonstrate the broad attestation to the themes of *universality* and *particularity* in Second Temple Judaism.

[30] 4Q504 f1-2 4:2-12, [Garcìa Martìnez & Tigchelaar (1997-1998), 1015].

> establish them in Thy Council according to the uprightness of Thy truth ... All the nations shall acknowledge Thy truth, and all the people Thy glory. For Thou wilt bring Thy glorious (salvation) to all the men of Thy Council, to those who share a common lot with the Angels of the Face.[31]

> And they will refine by them the chosen of justice and he will wipe out [al]l iniquity on account of his pio[us] ones; for the age of wickedness is fulfilled and all injustice will [pass a]way. [For] the time of justice has arrived, and the earth is filled with knowledge and the praise of God. In the da[ys of ...] the age of peace has arrived, and the laws of truth, and the testimony of justice, to instruct [all] in God's paths [and] in the mighty acts of his deeds [... f]or eternal centuries. Every t[ongue] will bless him, and every man will bow down before him, [and they will be] of on[e mi]nd.[32]

Common themes can be observed in these passages: Israel is the nation that YHWH has loved more than any nation, and Jerusalem is His chosen city. At a future time, Israel will be restored to the glory that it once knew. When this occurs, the nations will pay honor to the God of Israel.[33]

H. Talmudic Prayers

With regard to the prayers of the ancient synagogue, assigning dates of origin and tracing textual development are daunting and controversial tasks.[34] Nonetheless, the prayers of the tannaitic period do confirm the perpetuation of the themes of *universality* and *particularity* in Jewish thought and prayer.[35] One example is the *Kaddish*, which affirms the universal rule of YHWH in language very similar to that of the LP:

[31] 1QHa 14:8-13, [Vermes (2004), 277].

[32] 4Q215a 3-8, [Garcìa Martìnez & Tigchelaar (1997-1998), 457].

[33] Whether these acts of showing honor to Israel and to her God constitute salvation is a topic for discussion. While in the first two passages the notion of salvation may be a bit ambiguous, the last passage cited (4Q 215) is more explicit. Iniquity has been eradicated from the earth. If every tongue is praising YHWH, and every man is blessing Him, then these acts cannot be considered feigned obeisance or henotheism.

[34] See Elbogen (1913); Finkelstein (1925); Idelsohn (1995); Heinemann (1977); Petuchowski (1978b); Hoffman (1979); Zahavy (1990); Fleisher (1990); Reif (1993).

[35] i.e., whether or not these particular prayers, or earlier versions of them, were contemporary to Jesus is not germane to my present point. My purpose is to demonstrate that there was thematic continuity in prayer from the Second Temple period into the tannaitic era.

> Exalted and hallowed be His great Name in the world which He created according to His will. May He establish His kingdom in your lifetime and in your days, and in the lifetime of the whole household of Israel, speedily and at a near time.[36]

Another ancient prayer which affirms the unique identity of Israel and the future salvation of the nations is the *Alenu*. Among its declarations and petitions are found the following:

> It is for us to praise the Lord of all, to ascribe greatness to the God of creation. Who has not made us like the nations of other countries, nor placed us like the other families of the earth. He did not appoint our portion like theirs. Nor our destiny like that of their multitudes ... the Lord is God in the heavens above and on the earth below; there is none else ... We therefore hope in You, o Lord our God, That we may soon behold the glory of Your might, when idols will be removed from the earth, and non-gods will be utterly destroyed. When the world will be perfected under the rule of the Almighty, when all mankind will invoke Your Name ... Before You, O Lord our God, Let them bow down and worship. Giving honour unto Your glorious Name. May they all accept the yoke of Your kingdom, So that You will reign over them soon and forevermore. For Yours is the kingdom. And unto all eternity You will reign in glory.[37]

The pattern which emerges from these texts is characterized by what YHWH had spoken to Abraham: 'I will surely bless you ... and in your offspring shall all the nations of the earth be blessed.' (Gen 22:17-18) Israel viewed itself as a particular nation, chosen and blessed by YHWH. They believed that eventually this blessing would spread to all of the families of the earth. Donaldson notes that 'Israel's self-understanding required that the final establishment of God's glory should be universal and that the nations as well should be included in God's purposes.'[38] But the establishment of YHWH's universal blessings would not occur apart from His chosen people. YHWH had told Abraham that the nations would be blessed *through* His seed. Thus, Israel understood that God's purposes for the world could not go forward until she herself was restored.

[36] Petuchowski (1978a), 37.

[37] Petuchowski (1978a), 43.

[38] Donaldson (2007), 509.

I. Returning from Exile

Many of the above texts were written during times when the people of Israel found themselves scattered and subjugated. During such moments, Jews contemplated their current state of affairs and struggled to reconcile how YHWH's purposes on earth could be accomplished while the status of His chosen nation was so ignoble.[39] They often concluded that their sufferings were the consequence of their historical sins, as the nation had not honored the Deuteronomic Covenant.[40] Still, the people of Israel clung to an eschatological hope. Israel would someday be re-gathered from her captivity and restored to her land. Wright notes that this return from exile

> was seen as the inauguration of a new covenant between Israel and her god ... When Israel finally 'returned from exile,' and the Temple was (properly) rebuilt, and reinhabited by its proper occupant — this would be seen as comparable with the making of the covenant on Sinai. It would be the re-betrothal of YHWH and Israel, after their apparent divorce. It would be the real forgiveness of sins; Israel's god would pour out his holy spirit, so that she would be able to keep the Torah properly, from the heart.[41]

Israel would turn from her sins and re-affirm her Covenant with YHWH. The scattered tribes would be re-gathered, her enemies would be vanquished, Jerusalem and the temple would be made glorious, and the hearts of the people would once again be turned toward their God.

The people of Israel believed that the realization of all of these dreams would be brought about by prayer. Prayer was the means by which the nation would repent and be reconciled to God.[42] Prayer was their way of asking YHWH to remember His Covenant, and to act on behalf of His people.[43] Prayer was the needed invitation for God to intervene in human affairs.[44] Once Israel was restored, and the nations would come

39 See Ps 79; 88.

40 See Ps 106; 130; Dan 9; Neh 1.

41 Wright (1992), 301. For an excellent overview of the eschatology of the Second Temple period, see Wright (1992), 280-338.

42 See Isa 1:24-31; Joel 1:13-15; 2:1-20; Zeph 3:8-20; Zech 13:7-9. Nickelsburg (2003), 127-128, cites CD 6:2-11 and 1QS 8-9, arguing that the members of the *Yahad* viewed their repentance and Torah obedience as a sign of the last times.

43 See Ps 74; 80; 98.

44 Even the fatalism of the *Yahad* did not preclude them from viewing prayer as a needed ingredient in the accomplishment of YHWH's plans on earth. For example,

to worship her God, prayer would then be the offering that the Gentiles presented before Him.[45] Prayer was the articulation of Israel's eschatological hopes, and they knew that the restoration of their nation would not come to pass apart from this endeavor.

As we now turn our attention to the historical Jesus, we must see his proclamation and ministry against this backdrop. As he came onto the scene, Israel continued to affirm the supremacy of their God. They held to the hope that they would be exalted among the peoples of the earth. Many among them recognized their need to be brought back from exile, and they knew that they must renew their Covenant with their God. Prayer would play an essential role in this process, and thus it follows that it is a prominent feature in the teaching of Jesus.

IV. Jesus and the Deuteronomic Covenant

The public ministry of Jesus was immediately preceded by a forty-day period of wandering in the wilderness.[46] According to Matthew and Luke, Jesus was tested there by Satan, and he faced the same series of temptations as those which Adam and Eve had suffered in Eden: the lusts of the body,[47] the lust of the eyes,[48] and the desire to attain God-like power.[49] Sins of a similar nature had beset Israel in the Sinai wilderness. When they lacked food and water, they grumbled.[50] They worshipped a visually-pleasing golden idol. And they sought to appropriate power for themselves by appointing their own leader instead of the one God had chosen.[51] The passages in Matthew and Luke demonstrate that Jesus was aware of these precedents, especially those established by

4Q504 f1-2 2:7: 'O Lord, act, then, in accordance with yourself, in accordance with your great power.' [Garcìa Martìnez & Tigchelaar (1997-1998), 1013]

[45] See Mal 1:11; Isa 56:6-7.

[46] See Mt 4:1-11; Lk 4:1-12; Mk 1:12-13.

[47] Compare Gen 3:6, 'the woman saw that the tree was good for food,' to Mt 4:3, 'Command that these stones become bread.'

[48] Compare Gen 3:6 'and it was a delight to the eyes,' to Mt 4:8, 'And the devil took him to a very high mountain and showed him all the kingdoms of the world and their glory.'

[49] Compare Gen 3:6, 'and that the tree was desirable to make one wise,' to Mt 4:6, 'If you are the Son of God, throw yourself down.'

[50] See Ex 16; Num 20.

[51] See Ex 32; Num 14.

Israel in Sinai. When he responded to Satan at each juncture, he quoted from the book of the Deuteronomy:

> But he answered, 'It is written, "Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that comes from the mouth of God."' (Mt 4:3)[52]

> Jesus said to him, 'Again it is written, "You shall not put the Lord your God to the test."'(Mt 4:7)[53]

> Then Jesus said to him, 'Be gone, Satan! For it is written, "You shall worship the Lord your God and him only shall you serve."' (Mt 4:10)[54]

It emerges from these narratives that Jesus viewed himself as the personification of Israel. His forty days in the wilderness represented Israel's forty years in Sinai. Israel had grumbled because of their lack of food, but Jesus resisted the temptation to turn the stone to bread. Israel had made a golden calf, but Jesus refused to offer worship to anyone other than YHWH. Israel had put YHWH to the test at Meribah and Massa, but Jesus explicitly refused to do the same. He saw himself as one who had recapitulated the wilderness temptations of Israel, and prevailed where she had failed.

What follows the wilderness experience, in the accounts of both Matthew and Mark, is the beginning of Jesus' public proclamation. He began to preach this message: 'Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand,'(Mt 4:17) and, 'The time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of God is at hand; repent and believe in the gospel.' (Mk 4:15) In both accounts, Jesus then called together his twelve disciples.[55]

Jesus framed himself as the Son of Man for whom Israel had been waiting.[56] The fulfillment of Israel's eschatological hopes would begin with his call to repentance and righteousness.[57] As the one who had tak-

[52] See Lk 4:4; Dt 8:3.

[53] See Lk 4:8; Dt 6:16.

[54] See Lk 4:12; Dt 6:13.

[55] See Mt 4:18-22; Mk 1:15. There is a slight variation of events in Luke's account, where the pericope that follows the temptation narrative is the story of the Nazareth synagogue (Lk 4:16-30). It was there that Jesus read the Messianic passage from Isaiah 61, and subsequently proclaimed, 'Today this Scripture has been fulfilled in your hearing.' (LK 4:21) Shortly afterward (in the narrative), Jesus appointed his twelve disciples. (Lk 5:1-11)

[56] In the four Gospels, Jesus refers to himself 82 times by this title.

[57] Nickelsburg (2003), 137, notes that, 'The kingdom teaching ascribed to Jesus included a functional parallel to the notion of repentance in the Qumran texts.' He

en the place of Israel and overcome Satan's temptations, he led the way to a new era of purity. The re-gathering of the twelve tribes was symbolized in the calling of twelve disciples.[58] This was the new Israel, the era of which the prophets had spoken.

V. The Lord's Prayer and the Deuteronomic Covenant

A. The Prayer of the New Israel

Jesus had personified Israel, and fulfilled the Deuteronomic Covenant on her behalf. The LP was Jesus' way of inviting his followers to become the community of Covenant-fulfillment. It was given as the prayer of Israel in the eschaton that Jesus was inaugurating.[59] It would be an era of new intimacy with YHWH, and he invited his disciples to address their God in the same way he did: 'Father.'[60] Jesus was calling his followers to

cites Mk 10:17-31, Mt 18:12-14/ Lk 15:3-7, and Lk 16:1-9, 19:1-10 as evidence of the fact that Jesus viewed the repentance of sinners as a sign that the final days had arrived.

[58] See Mt 19:28; Lk 22:29; Act 1:15-26.

[59] It is in this regard that I consider the LP to be an eschatological prayer (i.e. dealing with the final age), but not necessarily an apocalyptic prayer (i.e. dealing with the end of the world). Lohmeyer (1965), Brown (1968), Jeremias (1978) et al., generally accept Kaseman's famous assertion that apocalyptic is the 'mother' of all theologies, and see a predominant futuristic orientation in the LP. In their view, it is a prayer directed toward the imminent 'end of the world.' I disagree. Wright (1996a), 95, notes: 'It has commonly been assumed, at least since Weiss and Schweitzer, that Jesus and many of his contemporaries expected the imminent end of the present space-time order altogether, the winding up of history and the ushering in of a new age in radical discontinuity with the present one. It is possible, however, to take the idea in quite a different sense: that Jesus and some of his contemporaries expected the end of the present world order, i.e. the end of the period when the Gentiles were lording it over the people of the true god, and the inauguration of the time when this god would take his power and reign and, in the process, restore the fortunes of his suffering people.' Much of this discussion will pivot around the notion of the Parousia. Jesus' teaching on this topic was interpreted differently by the Gospel authors. Whereas there are passages in Matthew and Mark that seem to suggest its imminence (e.g. Mt 24:34; Mk 13:29), it will be seen further on in this work that Luke, in particular, sought to avoid giving this impression. My position, with Wright, is that Jesus did not come to announce ***the End***, but rather to inaugurate the long-anticipated era of consummation.

[60] To address God as 'Father' in prayer was innovational, but not necessarily unorthodox. Deissler (1978), 5, remarks that, 'The prayers in the Old Testament do not know of the opening*abh* or *abhinu* (ie, "[Our] Father"). But Israel knows the title "father" as appellation for its covenantal God.' Jeremias (1978), 97, suggest that in the original aramaic, the opening address would have been '*abba*.' He comments: 'In the Lord's Prayer Jesus authorizes his disciples to repeat the word *abba* after him. He gives

become all that which Israel was supposed to be. His prayer echoed the *universality* and *particularity* which were characteristic of the Deuteronomic Covenant. YHWH was once again affirmed as the one true God over all the earth. Through the excellence of His people, His glory and fame would be spread among the nations.

We will now look specifically at these themes as they are presented in the LP.[61]

B. Universality in the Lord's Prayer

The fundamental affirmation of the Deuteronomic Covenant is that Israel's God is the one God, who alone is to be worshipped: 'Hear O Israel, YHWH our God, YHWH is one.'[62] In the Sinai wilderness, Israel had failed to honor this command, but Jesus affirmed his commitment to it during his sojourn in the wilderness.[63] If the followers of Jesus were to be incorporated into the new Israel, they must also make this fundamental affirmation. Thus, the universality of YHWH is one of the predominant themes of the LP. It is particularly evident in the opening address and in the first three petitions of the prayer. We will now look at this first section of the LP, paying close attention to how its petitions express the theme of universality, even as they point the way to the particularity of Jesus and his followers.

1. The One God in Heaven

In Matthew's text, the prayer is addressed to 'our Father in heaven.'[64] The reference to God as the one who is in 'in heaven' is of great significance. To the modern ear, this expression may simply denote the locus of God's dwelling place. In the ears of the ancient Jews, however, it was an

them a share in his sonship and empowers them, as his disciples, to speak with their heavenly Father in just such a familiar, trusting way as a child would with his father.'

[61] As we now look at the specific themes of the LP, we will make no effort to delineate the *ipissima vox Jesu*. Rather, we will assume that the early texts of the LP (Mt 6:9-13; Lk 11:2-4; and the *Didache* 8:2) convey the words of Jesus *accurately*, if not *precisely*. Jesus' original emphasis may have been more on content and pattern rather than on specific wording, as Donald Hagner (1993) 145, has suggested. Given the dual attestation of the *Didache* and Matthew, we will here engage with the longer, seven-petition form of the prayer (in contrast to Luke's five-petition version).

[62] שְׁמַע יִשְׂרָאֵל יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ יְהוָה אֶחָד (Dt 6:4). As part of the thrice-daily recitation of the *Shema*, this has been the affirmation of Jews throughout the centuries.

[63] See Mt 4:10; Lk 4:12; Dt 6:13.

[64] Πάτερ ἡμῶν ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς (Mt 6:9).

affirmation of the absolute kingship of YHWH above all other gods. In the book of Deuteronomy Moses had proclaimed to Israel, 'Know therefore today, and lay it to your heart, that the Lord is God in heaven above and on the earth beneath; there is no other.' (Dt 4:39) The same idea is expressed in Ps 115: 1-3: 'Why should the nations say, "Where is their God?" Our God is in the heavens; he does all that he pleases. Their idols are silver and gold, the work of human hands.'[65] Hence, the declaration that YHWH was 'in heaven' would be the equivalent of saying, 'There is no other god in all of the universe. He is the one God, the only God.'

2. The Will of the One God

In Psalm 115:3 (cited above), the assertion that God rules in heaven is accompanied by the declaration, 'He does all that he pleases.'[66] The correlation between YHWH's sovereignty in heaven and the doing of his will is found in various ancient prayer s and texts. For example, in Psalms 135:5-6 it says: 'For I know that the Lord is great, and that our Lord is above all gods. Whatever the Lord pleases, he does, in heaven and on earth, in the seas and all deeps.'[67] Avi Hurvitz has demonstrated that the expression, 'he does all that he pleases' dates from the Second Temple era, and was broadly used to denote the absolute sovereignty of a ruler.[68] Thus, 'your will be done on earth as it is heaven,' (Mt 6:10) is a reconfiguration (in petitionary form) of the notion expressed in Psalms

[65] Another particularly lucid example is 2 Chr 20: 6: 'O Lord, God of our fathers, are you not God in heaven? You rule over all the kingdoms of the nations. In your hand are power and might, so that none is able to withstand you.' See also Josh 2:11; 1 Chr 16:26; Ezra 1:2, 5:11-12, 6:10, 7:12, 21, 23; 9:6; Dan 2:18-19, 28, 37, 44; 4:37; 5:23; Ps 2:4, 96:4-5; 136:26; Isa 14:12-13; 63:15, 66:1; Jer 10:11; Jon 1:9; and the *Alenu*, which declares, 'the Lord is God in the heavens above and on the earth below; there is none else.'

[66] וֵאלֹהֵינוּ בַשָּׁמָיִם כֹּל אֲשֶׁר־חָפֵץ עָשָׂה

[67] כִּי אֲנִי יָדַעְתִּי כִּי־גָדוֹל יְהוָה וַאֲדֹנֵינוּ מִכָּל־אֱלֹהִים
כֹּל אֲשֶׁר־חָפֵץ יְהוָה עָשָׂה בַּשָּׁמַיִם וּבָאָרֶץ בַּיַּמִּים וְכָל־תְּהוֹמוֹת
Variations of, 'he does as he pleases' are also found in Ecc 8:3; Jon 1:14, and Isa 46:10.

[68] Hurvitz (1982), 257-258, notes, 'The phrase refers either to God (Psalms, Isaiah, Jonah) or to an earthly king (Ecclesiastes) and denotes the unlimited power of the supreme authority which enables him "to do whatever he pleases." At first glance, this idiom would seem to be a rhetorical phrase lauding the omnipotent ruler. However, a closer examination reveals that, in fact, this is no empty literary cliché but, rather, the adoption of a legal formula whose *Sitz im Leben* is to be sought in the domain of jurisprudence.' Weinfeld (2003) traces the liturgical continuity of this expression from the prayers of Qumran to medieval Jewish liturgy.

135:6, 'Whatever the Lord pleases, he does, in heaven and on earth.'[69] Both the petition and the statement express the absolute power and authority of the one true God.

Exploring the theology of these phrases, the question arises as to whether the declaration in Psalms 135 takes for granted that God's will is already done on earth (i.e. by stating that He does what He pleases), while the petition in Matthew 6:10 presupposes that His will *is not* fully not done on earth (i.e. by asking for His will to be done). To gain insight on this matter, we go back to the text of Psalms 115. This passage opens by declaring the absolute sovereignty of God,[70] and then continues with a polemic against idolatry.[71] An internal tension is created in this passage, because the absolute authority of YHWH seems to be flouted by those who choose to worship idols. This tension is resolved at the end of the Psalm, where the author declares, 'The heavens are the Lord's heavens, but the earth he has given to the children of man.' (Ps 115:16) Thus, the implication is that men are able to practice evil on earth because it the realm that has been placed under their dominion. YHWH is the absolute ruler of the universe, but on earth He has given men control over their own conduct.

This notion bears upon Jesus' presentation of this petition in the LP. The expression 'your will be done on earth as it is in heaven' is laden with the idea of God's absolute authority, yet it also acknowledges the freedom of man's will. YHWH is the Lord who does what He pleases, but men may choose whether or not they will submit to Him. It is a prayer for God to assert Himself, and to manifest His authority on the earth. Yet it is also a prayer for YHWH to change human hearts, to turn women and men away from their rebellion and to draw them to obedience.[72] The eschatological expectation of ancient Israel was that YHWH would come to judge sin on earth and eradicate all evil. This petition evokes a longing for that day's arrival. But it also expresses a hope that people will first repent. The request is that God's will on earth would be effected by human choice, and not merely by the assertion of God's authority.

[69] Compare Matthew's text, γενηθήτω τὸ θέλημά σου ὡς ἐν οὐρανῷ καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς to LXX Ps 134:6, πάντα, ὅσα ἠθέλησεν ὁ κύριος, ἐποίησεν ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ καὶ ἐν τῇ γῇ.

[70] Ps 115:1-3.

[71] Ps 115:4-8.

[72] This is the notion that underlies Jesus' proclamations: 'Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand;' (Mt 3:2) and, 'The time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of God is at hand; repent and believe in the gospel.' (Mk 1:15)

3. The Kingdom of the One God

When Jesus taught his followers to pray 'your kingdom come,'[73] he was making use of a phrase that was uncommon, but yet not indecipherable to the Jews of his day. Insomuch as the expression denotes the absolute kingship and power of YHWH over His people, over the earth, and over other gods — Jesus was not saying anything new or controversial. But the establishment of God's 'kingdom' on earth was not widely attested in ancient Jewish literature.[74] James Dunn notes that the declaration 'God is "our/my King" is an affirmation of God's election of Israel to be his people chosen from out of all the peoples on the earth.' But the idea that 'God's royal rule will be manifested to all, is a summary of a much more diffuse and diverse expectation.'[75]

The historical basis for this notion can be traced back to the book of Deuteronomy. While the motif of 'kingship' does not feature prominently in the Deuteronomic Covenant, elements are found therein that would pave the way for its later thematic development. James Dunn notes:

> Based on Deut. 30.1-10, there was a widespread belief that after a period of dispersion among the nations, the outcasts/scattered of Israel would be gathered again and brought back to the promised land, the unity of the twelve tribes reestablished, and the relation of Israel as God's people, and Yahweh as Israel's God, restored.[76]

According to this passage, the time would come when a scattered Israel would recall the blessings and curses of the Covenant.[77] They would repent, and return to YHWH, and He would restore their fortunes

[73] ἐλθέτω ἡ βασιλεία σου (Mt 6:10, Lk 11:2).

[74] Dunn (2003), 385, notes that, 'In the Scriptures and post-biblical writings of Second Temple Judaism the phrase itself is hardly attested, and though reference is made to God's 'kingdom' or 'kingship,' the theme is not particularly prominent.' Nickelsburg (2003) cites the following examples in Jewish literature: 'The kingdom of God' (Wis 10.10; Pss. Sol. 17.3); 'The kingdom (*malkut*) of Yahweh' (1 Chr 28.5; 2 Chr 13.8); 'my kingdom' (1 Chr 17.14); 'his kingdom' (Ps 103.19; Dan 4.34; 6.26; Tob 13.1; Wis 6.4); 'your kingdom' (Ps 145.11-13; Pss. Sol. 5.18); 'Kingship (*mamlaka, meluka*)' belongs to God (1 Chr 29.11; Ps 22.28; Obad 21); Aramaic *malkuta* (Dan 3.33; 4.34); Latin *regnum* (T. Mos. 10.1).

[75] Dunn (2003), 393.

[76] Dunn (2003), 393. Wright (1992), 268-271 and 299-301, refers to this theme as the 'return from exile.'

[77] Dt 30:1.

and bring them back to the land.[78] At that time, He would make them 'more prosperous and numerous' than their fathers,[79] renew their love for Him, and give them victory over their enemies:

> And the Lord your God will circumcise your heart and the heart of your offspring, so that you will love the Lord your God with all your heart and with all your soul, that you may live. And the Lord your God will put all these curses on your foes and enemies who persecuted you. (Dt 30:6-7)

In the era of Second Temple Judaism, this theme of 'return from exile' became increasingly associated with the promise of David's son.[80] A king would come to restore the fortunes of Israel and give her victory over her enemies. According to Psalm 72, this 'royal son' would: judge the poor with justice,[81] usher in prosperity,[82] bring peace,[83] establish Israel's dominion over all the earth,[84] and in fulfillment of the promise to Abraham he would be blessed, and bring blessing to all nations.[85]

The realization of these hopes is present in Jesus' proclamation of the kingdom. He characterized his ministry by his mercy towards the poor: 'The blind receive their sight and the lame walk, lepers are cleansed and the deaf hear, and the dead are raised up, and the poor have good news preached to them.' (Mt 11:5) He proclaimed that his mission was to bring liberty to the captives, freedom to the oppressed, and to 'proclaim the year of the Lord's favor.' (Lk 4:1) These were all themes associated with the return from exile and the restoration of the nation.

In consideration of the way that Jesus fulfilled messianic prophecy, James Dunn notes that Jesus' message of the kingdom has to do

[78] Dt 30:2-3.

[79] Dt 30:5.

[80] Dunn (2003), 395-396, notes that the promise of the Messiah figured differently among various groups: 'Although this hope is often referred to as "the messianic age" the involvement of a particular (messianic) figure or divine agent seems to be more like another variation.'

[81] Ps 72:2, 4, 12-14.

[82] Ps 72:3, 15-16.

[83] Ps 72:7.

[84] Ps 72:8.

[85] Ps 72:17.

> with what had previously been hopes and expectations for the future ... Things were happening that earlier generations had longed to see. Something new, of life-changing value, was already before his hearers. Sight was being restored to the blind, the lame were walking, even the dead raised. Good news was being preached to the poor: the kingdom was theirs![86]

But even as Jesus fulfilled many of Israel's expectations, there were others that he sought to redefine. Jews in the Second Temple period had come to see the restoration of their nation as being both political and material. In this sense, Jesus was perceived by many as a disappointment. Wright notes that

> Christian kingdom-language has little or nothing to do with the vindication of ethnic Israel, the overthrow of Roman rule in Palestine, the building of a new Temple on Mount Zion, the establishment of Torah-observance, or the nations flocking to Mount Zion to be judged and/or to be educated in the knowledge of YHWH.[87]

Consequently, in order for Jesus' mission to succeed, these aspects of Jewish eschatological hopes had to be re-articulated. Jesus accomplished this task by redefining the kingdom as righteous living, victory over Satan, and the restoration of the human heart.[88]

Thus, Jesus' message stood in continuity with certain traditional expectations of the kingdom, even as he gave new meaning to others. What made his message particularly unique, however, was the role that he claimed for himself. 'Jesus was certain that God had a purpose for his creation which was unfolding, indeed, was reaching toward its climax, and that his own mission was an expression of that purpose and a vital agency toward its fulfillment.'[89] There was an exclusivity to Jesus' proclamation of the kingdom, namely, that it could not be obtained apart from him.[90]

[86] Dunn (2003), 466.

[87] Wright (1996a), 219.

[88] Cf. Mt 5:3; 19-20; 6:33; 7:21; 12:28; 13:11(Mk 4:11; Lk 8:10); 13: 18-23, 44-47; 18:3-4; 25:34-36; Mk 4:47, 10:14-15; Lk 6:20; 9:2; 11:20.

[89] Dunn (2003), 465.

[90] This is particularly evident in Jesus' statement to his disciples, 'To you it has been given to know the secrets of the kingdom of God, but for others they are in parables, so that "seeing they may not see, and hearing they may not understand."' (Lk 8:10) Cf. Mt 13:11. Jesus asserts that the kingdom can only be known by the revelation that comes through him.

The timing of the kingdom's arrival was another unique feature of Jesus' teaching. Contrary to the singular, all-at-once manifestation of God's reign which many Jews expected,[91] Jesus spoke of the kingdom as a both a present reality and as a future hope.[92] All that the kingdom represented was present in his ministry, yet its universal consummation was an event for which his followers were to work, hope and pray. Marshall describes this dual nature of the kingdom in the following terms:

> God's purpose, prophesied in the Old Testament, was being brought to fulfillment in an unexpected manner. The best way to express this is probably in terms of concealment or veiled manifestation. What this means is that the popular expectation of the KG was of an open, public, and final act of sovereignty by God that would establish his rule in the world and bring its benefits to his people, but Jesus believed and taught that God was already acting in his ministry powerfully but secretly to establish that realm and to initiate a chain of events that would lead up to and include the End of popular expectation. There was thus a real and genuine manifestation of God's power, but it was in a sense veiled and secret.[93]

The kingdom of God in the proclamation of Jesus defied certain eschatological expectations of Jesus' Jewish contemporaries. Those who were waiting for a violent overthrow of Israel's oppressors, the enthroning of a new Davidic king, and the immediate exaltation of the nation, were to be disappointed. The kingdom that Jesus announced was a quiet revolution, one that would transform hearts long before its political impact would be seen.

In sum, we have seen that Jesus' instruction to pray 'your kingdom come' has various dimensions. It is a petition that stands in continuity with traditional Jewish affirmations of universalism. It connotes that YHWH is the one true God, the Lord and Master over all of the earth, and that He will ultimately reveal Himself to all humanity by establishing His authority on earth. Hence, through this petition Jesus' fol-

[91] Even the disciples of Jesus seemed prone to this view, asking after his ascension, 'Lord, will you at this time restore the kingdom to Israel?' (Act 1:6)

[92] Passages that speak of the kingdom as a present reality include: Mt 4:23; 5:3; 10:2; 13:11; 13:19-23; 13:31-33; 16:19; 19:33; Mk 4:11; 10:14-15; Lk 6:20; 8:10; 11:20; 17:21. Passages that speak of the kingdom as future event include Mt 5:19-20; 7:21; 8:11; 13:24-30; 18:3; 25:34; Mk 4:47; 14:25; Lk 13:28; 19:11-27; 22:16, 18, 30.

[93] Marshall (1990), 220.

lowers were expressing, in the company of all Jews, their deep desire for YHWH to establish His reign.[94]

But there were aspects of Jesus teaching that stood in discontinuity to the traditional hopes. First, there was the assertion that the establishment of God's rule on earth would occur through him. Jesus insisted that he was the one to restore Israel from exile, and that in him the hopes of the Davidic son would be fulfilled. Thus, when Jesus' followers prayed 'your kingdom come,' they recognized that he himself was the one through whom their petition would be answered. Second, Jesus presented a veiled manifestation of God's rule. Even as his followers prayed for its future consummation, they also recognized that it was already in their midst. They were experiencing the kingdom as they witnessed his deeds, heard his message, and participated in his mission.

To pray for the coming of the kingdom, was therefore an assertion that there is one king, one Lord, one ruler of all. It was yet another way of declaring, 'YHWH our God, YHWH is one.'[95] Yet on the lips of Jesus' followers, the kingdom of God also signified the unique role of their master. He was the one who held the secrets of the kingdom. He alone understood that it was both a present reality and a future hope. And it was through his agency that it would come. Thus, their prayer was a declaration of the particularity of Jesus. It was a recognition that the kingdom had already arrived through him, and that the secret to its final consummation was found in him alone.

4. The Sanctification of the Name

Jewish Scriptures describe the holiness of YHWH as unalterable.[96] However, *the name* of God represents something distinct from His *person*. A name describes how one is portrayed, and how he is perceived. Thus, the name of God denotes His honor and His reputation

[94] We have cited above the *Kaddish*, which declares: 'Exalted and hallowed be His great Name in the world which He created according to His will. May He establish His kingdom and cause His salvation to sprout. And hasten the coming of His messiah, in your lifetime and in your days, and in the lifetime of the whole household of Israel, speedily and at a near time.' [Petuchowski (1978a), 37] The *Amidah* declares in the eleventh blessing: 'Restore our judges as at first. And our counsellors as at the beginning; and reign over us — You alone.' [Petuchowski (1978a), 28]

[95] Dt 6:4.

[96] Cf. Ex 15:11; Lev 11:44, 45; 20:7, 26; 21:8; 1 Sam 2:2; 6:20; 1 Chr 16:29; Ps 99:5; Isa 5:16; 6:3; 43:3; Hab 1:12; Zech 8:20.

on earth.[97] Within the framework of the Deuteronomic Covenant, the name of YHWH is sanctified when Israel obeys. Their righteous conduct demonstrates that they fear Him as holy, and it makes His holiness manifest in all the earth. Concomitantly, His name is tarnished by Israel's rebellion.[98] Their disobedience dishonors Him, and portrays Him as dishonorable to the nations.

The prophets of Israel depicted YHWH as being jealous for the sanctity of His own name. Isaiah 29: 23 states:

> Jacob shall no more be ashamed, no more shall his face grow pale. For when he sees his children, the work of my hands, in his midst, they will sanctify my name[99] they will sanctify the Holy One of Jacob and will stand in awe of the God of Israel.

Ezekiel 36:23 says:

> I will sanctify my great name,[100] which has been profaned among the nations, and which you have profaned among them; and the nations shall know that I am the Lord, says the Lord GOD, when through you I display my holiness before their eyes.[101]

In the passage from Isaiah, it is Jacob who sanctifies the name of God. In Ezekiel, it is YHWH who sanctifies His own name. In the latter case, YHWH acts to sanctify His name because it had previously been profaned by Israel. Thus, it can be said that in the Deuteronomic Covenant, the sanctification of God's name was initially meant to be carried out by Israel. However, when Israel failed to honor Him, then YHWH would act to uphold His own honor among the nations.

Thus, the petition 'hallowed by your name'[102] is primarily concerned with the conduct and testimony of God's people. It is the prayer of the new Israel, asking the Father's help to live righteous, obedient lives that would give honor to His name. A corollary to this notion, however, is

[97] Crossan (2010), 52 notes, 'Your good name is the favorable view that others have of you. Name is your reputation or, in other cultures, your face, your countenance, your honor. The name of God means both God's identity and God's reputation as known externally to human beings in God's world.'

[98] Cf. Lev 18:2; 19:12; 21:6; 22:2, 31-32; Dt 28:10, 58; Ez 36:17-32; 39:7.

[99] יַקְדִּ֣ישׁוּ שְׁמִ֑י LXX: ἁγιάσουσιν τὸ ὄνομά μου.

[100] וְקִדַּשְׁתִּ֞י אֶת־שְׁמִ֣י הַגָּד֗וֹל LXX: ἁγιάσω τὸ ὄνομά μου τὸ μέγα.

[101] NRSV.

[102] ἁγιασθήτω τὸ ὄνομά σου (Mt 6:9, Lk 11:2).

that even as they strive to bring honor to His name, God is also able to bring honor to Himself. Thus, the new Israel asks YHWH to manifest Himself in such a way that all the peoples of earth will see His power and acknowledge Him as the one true God.

5. Conclusions

It is seen that the theme of YHWH's universal sovereignty is predominant in the LP. He is the God who is in heaven, who does whatever He pleases. He is the one and only King. He is the one whose name must be honored as holy by all nations. These assertions of YHWH's absolute power all stood in continuity with Israel's traditional concept of their God.

What made Jesus unique among his contemporaries was his assertion that the excellence of YHWH's power and authority was being revealed through him. He claimed to be the fulfillment of Israel's messianic expectations, even as he redefined the manner in which these hopes would be realized. In order to support these claims, it was incumbent upon him to demonstrate the power of his message in the lives of his followers.

When Jesus invited his disciples to pray the LP, he did so in the recognition that YHWH's universal sovereignty had not been recognized by the nations because Israel had failed to keep the terms of the Covenant. If he claimed to hold the 'secrets of the kingdom,' then his followers had to succeed where the Israel-of-old had failed. In a sense, he staked his reputation on the conduct of his disciples. His new Israel had to establish its identity as a holy nation and a particular people, so that in their exaltation the supremacy of their God would be recognized by all.

The excellence of the new Israel is the predominant theme of the last four petitions of the LP. 'Give us our daily bread,' 'forgive us our as we forgive,' 'lead us not into testing,' and 'deliver us from evil,' all focus on the righteousness, victory and nobility of YHWH's people. Jesus' expectation was that his followers would walk in relational dependence on the Father, forgiveness toward one another, righteousness, and victory over Satan. On this basis they would establish their identity as the Israel of the Covenant, and validate the teachings of their Master.

C. *Particularity in the Lord's Prayer*

1. Victory in the Sinai

Considering the motif of *particularity*, we find that once again the LP evokes the imagery of Israel in Sinai. Jesus' forty-day sojourn in the wilderness was an important precursor to his teaching on this prayer. The new Israel could not fail in the same way as their ancestors. In his own wilderness experience, Jesus had demonstrated how a man or woman could remain faithful to the Deuteronomic Covenant, even in the midst of trial. It was through the LP that he taught his followers how to walk out the example that he had set.

2. A Day's Portion of Bread Everyday

The first allusion in the LP to the Sinai journey is found in the found in the petition, 'Give us this day our daily bread.'[103] Although there has been considerable discussion with regard to the exact meaning of ἐπιούσιος,[104] the predominant (and I would assert, *correct*) translation in English remains 'daily.' The term refers to the portion necessary for one day.[105] Thus, an equivalent translation is, 'give us this day our bread for the day.' We see in this phrase an obvious redundancy that merits explanation. It would have been sufficient to say, 'Give us our daily bread' or, 'Give us bread today.' We must conclude that the duplicate mention

[103] Matthew's text (6:11) reads: τὸν ἄρτον ἡμῶν τὸν ἐπιούσιον δὸς ἡμῖν σήμερον. Luke's text (11:3) is slightly different: τὸν ἄρτον ἡμῶν τὸν ἐπι•ύσι•ν δίδου ἡμῖν τὸ καθ ἡμέραν.

[104] See Scott (1951), 98-99; Lohmeyer (1965), 134-155; Laymon (1968), 106-117; Ayo (1992), 56-67.

[105] Ayo (1992), 60, offers a concise overview of the matter: 'Although there is no complete agreement on the origin of *epi•usi•s*, speculation has centered upon two possible roots for the word. One is that it derived from the word meaning to come or to be near, [*ep-ienai*], which suggests a translation of "the coming day" or "tomorrow" ... The other possible root word is *epi-einai*, related to the verb "to be" and meaning needed or required for subsistence. This root suggests a translation of "substantial" or "essential": bread that is necessary, or sufficient, or the bread which must be at hand, that is, daily bread. Werner Foerster claims that when all the derivation arguments are joined, it is safe to say *epi•usi•s* somehow defines the amount of bread. The bread is for today, much as the manna in the desert was a daily gift of just what was needed, neither too much nor too little.'

It should also be noted that although it was once believed that that the term *epi•usi•s* had been found in the Hawara papyrus (a fifth-century cookbook), Nijman and Worp (1999) have definitively shown that this manuscript was, in fact, misread. Thus, there are no attestations of this term outside of the LP.

of *day* (with regard to both portion and frequency) was a deliberate allusion to the manna given in the Sinai wilderness: 'a day's portion every day.' (Exodus 16:4)[106]

The full text of Exodus 16:4 reads, 'Then the Lord said to Moses, "Behold, I am about to rain bread from heaven for you, and the people shall go out and gather a day's portion every day, that I may test them, whether they will walk in my law or not."' There was a reason why the people would only be given a measured amount each day. Israel's commitment to the entire Covenant would be reflected in their attitude toward their daily provisions. Moses would later explain, 'And he humbled you and let you hunger and fed you with manna ... that he might make you know that man does not live by bread alone, but man lives by every word that comes from the mouth of the Lord.' (Dt 8:3)

In the LP, Jesus instructed his followers to request each day only the amount of bread needed for that day. This was to be, above all, an affirmation of trust in God. It was a way of saying: 'Our security in life will not be found in abundance of food, nor in any other material thing — but our security will found in the Father alone.' Jesus had given them the example during his own temptation in the wilderness. He had overcome Satan by asserting his ultimate dependence on the word of the Lord. In teaching his followers to pray this petition, he invited them to do the same.

3. Lead us not into Testing

In Exodus 16: 4 (cited above), we note that YHWH declared that He would deliberately test the people. Yet, in the LP Jesus taught his followers to pray, 'lead us not into testing.'[107] This leads to the question: Was testing to be considered to be something *constructive* or something *detrimental* to the nation's well-being? The answer becomes clear as we consider the historical situations in which the verb נִסָּה ('to test') ap-

[106] In this verse, 'a days portion every day' in the Hebrew reads דְּבַר־יוֹם בְּיוֹמוֹ which may literally be translated, 'the matter of a day in its own day.' The LXX reads, τὸ τῆς ἡμέρας εἰς ἡμέραν, which may be literally translated, 'that which belongs to a day, on the day.' Both of these constructions demonstrate the same redundancy of τὸν ἄρτον ἡμῶν τὸν ἐπιούσιον δὸς ἡμῖν σήμερον.

[107] The wording in Luke and Matthew is identical: καὶ μὴ εἰσενέγκῃς ἡμᾶς εἰς πειρασμόν. The noun πειρασμὸν which is often translated in the LP as 'temptation' is derived from πειράζω, meaning 'to test.' Ex 16:4, 'that I may test them' in the LXX reads, ὅπως πειράσω αὐτοὺς.

pears.[108] At times, this verb describes the initiative of YHWH in testing Israel;[109] and at other times, it denotes Israel's testing of YHWH.[110] The only common denominator between the disparate applications of this term is that in all cases, Israel was depicted as being mired in doubt and sin.[111] Grumbling and rebellion among the people of Israel were characterized as 'putting God to the test.'[112] At the same time, when YHWH questioned the commitment of the people, He would put them to 'the test.'[113] Thus, it is seen that the connotation of נָסָה is predominantly negative. When YHWH had full confidence in the faithfulness of the nation, no testing was necessary.

Thus, in the LP, it is this connotation of the term that matters most. Testing may come by the initiative of God, or it may be expressed in the actions and attitudes of the people. 'Lead us not into testing' means 'don't put us to the test,' even as it articulates the plea: 'don't let us test you.' In either case, the only way to avoid such testing was to be committed and faithful. Massah, the place of testing in the Sinai wilderness, had become a metaphor for hardness of heart.[114] In his own wilderness experience, Jesus had resisted Satan's temptation, citing Dt 8:2, which reads (the full text), 'You shall not put the Lord your God to the test, as you tested him at Massah.' Jesus and the new Israel would not repeat the mistakes of their predecessors. They would not go back to Massah. Thus, the full meaning of the expression, 'Lead us not into testing' was something like this: 'Let us not go back to the sins of our forefathers. Let us be a people whose hearts are fully committed to you, so that we might not test you, and that you may find no need to test us.'

108 In the LXX, נָסָה is translated as πειράζω 31 out of the 36 times this verb appears in the Hebrew text.

109 e.g., Ex 15:25; 16:4; 20:20; Dt 4:34; 8:2, 16; 13:3; Jds 2:22; 3:1, 4.

110 Ex 17:2; Dt 6:16; 33:8; Isa 7:12; Ps 78:18, 41, 56; 95:9; 106:14.

111 נָסָה appears in 34 verses, with 11 morally 'neutral' applications, e.g., 1 Sam 17:39, 1 Kings 10:9. There are also two instances in Scripture where the verb is used to describe the testing of the righteous: Gen 22:1 (the testing of Abraham) and Ps 26:2.

112 e.g., Ex 17:7, 'And he called the name of the place Massah and Meribah, because of the quarreling of the people of Israel, and because they tested the Lord by saying, "Is the Lord among us or not?"'

113 e.g., Dt 8:2, 'And you shall remember the whole way that the Lord your God has led you these forty years in the wilderness, that he might humble you, testing you to know what was in your heart, whether you would keep his commandments or not.'

114 Cf., Ps 95:6-11; Heb 3:7-11.

4. Victory Over Evil

In Matthew's text, the petition, 'lead us not into testing' is paired with the petition, 'but deliver us from evil' (or 'from *the evil one*').[115] This request also resonated strongly with Jesus' experience in the wilderness. Just as Jesus overcame Satan and resisted the temptation to sin — so he invited his followers to pray for the same victory.

The notion of victory over evil oppositional forces is a foundational theme in the epic story of Israel. In the garden of Eden, YHWH had declared to the serpent: 'I will put enmity between you and the woman, and between your offspring and her offspring; he shall bruise your head, and you shall bruise his heel.' (Gen 3:15) From the offspring of Eve would come one who would wound Satan with a mortal blow. This theme is again seen in the Abrahamic promise, where God declared, 'Your offspring shall possess the gate of his enemies, and in your offspring shall all the nations of the earth be blessed.' (Gen 3:18) The family of Abraham would bring blessing to all nations of the earth, but this process would be marked by conflict with 'enemies' over whom YHWH promised victory.

The theme of conflict is featured prominently within the Deuteronomic history. If Israel would honor the Covenant, the Lord would drive out her enemies before her and she would take possession of the land:

> When you go out to war against your enemies, and see horses and chariots and an army larger than your own, you shall not be afraid of them, for the Lord your God is with you, who brought you up out of the land of Egypt. And when you draw near to the battle, the priest shall come forward and speak to the people and shall say to them, 'Hear, O Israel, today you are drawing near for battle against your enemies: let not your heart faint. Do not fear or panic or be in dread of them, for the Lord your God is he who goes with you to fight for you against your enemies, to give you the victory.' (Dt 20:1-4)[116]

Israel's historical failure to conquer her enemies loomed large upon the generation of Jesus. Having lived under the oppression of foreign nations for generations, the Jews of first-century Palestine longed for free-

[115] ἀλλὰ ῥῦσαι ἡμιᾶς ἀπὸ τοῦ πονηροῦ (Mt 6:13).

[116] See also Dt 11:1-25; 12:28-30; 28:1-14.

dom and sovereignty.[117] Jesus' task had been two-fold. First, he sought to redefine Israel's conceptualization of their 'enemies.' He turned their attention away from the notion of 'foreign oppressors,' toward those of Satan and the power of sin.[118] Second, Jesus demonstrated his own power to defeat the true enemy. The triumph in the wilderness, the declaration of forgiveness, healing, deliverance from demonic oppression, his resurrection and ascension all formed part of what the Gospel authors would characterize as Jesus' victory over the evil one.[119]

Thus, 'deliver us from evil' is to be understood as a petition to participate in the victory of Jesus — to triumph over sin, Satan, and ultimately death. Jesus had attained for Israel what she had historically failed to achieve. YHWH had once intended to demonstrate ancient Israel's particularity by driving out enemy nations before her. She had failed because she did not honor the Covenant, and her political defeat became emblematic of her powerlessness over evil. Jesus came as the personification of Israel. He showed her that the real enemy was not Rome nor the Greeks, but rather Satan, and the internal enemy of sin. He himself had overcome Satan and he showed the way to live in freedom from sin. In effect, he conquered evil on behalf of his people. The LP was an invitation to share in his triumph.

[117] Wright (1996a) 206, notes that this notion is strongly tied to the expectations surrounding the coming of the kingdom: 'If, then, someone were to speak to Jesus' contemporaries of YHWH's becoming king, we may safely assume that they would have in mind, in some form or other, this two-sided story concerning the double reality of exile. Israel would 'really' return from exile; YHWH would finally return to Zion. But if these were to happen there would have to be a third element as well: evil, usually in the form of Israel's enemies, must be defeated. Together these three themes form the meta-narrative implicit in the language kingdom.'

[118] Wright (1996a), 173, comments: 'Jesus was affirming the basic beliefs and aspirations of the kingdom: Israel's god is lord of the world, and, if Israel is still languishing in misery, he must act to defeat her enemies and vindicate her. Jesus was not doing away with that basic Jewish paradigm. He was reaffirming it most strongly ... He was, however, redefining the Israel that was to be vindicated, and hence was also redrawing Israel's picture of her true enemies.' He says further on: 'The return from exile, the defeat of evil, and the return of YHWH to Zion were all coming about, but not in the way Israel had supposed. The time of restoration vas at hand, and people of all sorts were summoned to share and enjoy it ... Jesus was therefore summoning his hearers to be Israel in a new way ... In the course of all this, he was launching the decisive battle with the real satanic enemy — a different battle, and a different enemy, from those Israel had envisaged.' [Wright (1996a), 201]

[119] See Mt 12:22-29; Mk 3:22-26; Lk 10:1-19; 13:32; Jn 12:27-32; Act 2:22-36.

5. Forgiveness

The forgiveness which the new Israel received from the Father, and which they extend to one another, was another indication of their unique calling and identity. Throughout the Scriptures it is seen that the overarching purpose of forgiveness is to bring about the restoration of relationships broken by sin. Israel's relationship with God had always been dependent on the mercy of YHWH, who had declared of Himself, 'YHWH, YHWH, a God merciful and gracious, slow to anger, and abounding in steadfast love and faithfulness, keeping steadfast love for thousands, forgiving iniquity and transgression and sin.' (Ex 34:6-7)[120] In the same way, He expected His people to extend forgiveness to one another: 'You shall not take vengeance or bear a grudge against the sons of your own people, but you shall love your neighbor as yourself: I am YHWH.' (Lev 19:18) This fundamental maintenance of right relationships — both vertical and horizontal — was essential to Israel's identity as a chosen people. It is in this same way that the followers of Jesus had to walk. They would be known for their right relationship with the Father, and by their love for one another. Therefore, Jesus taught them to pray, 'forgive us our sins as we forgive those who sin against us.'

6. Particularity in the LP: Conclusions

During the time of his own testing in the wilderness, Jesus demonstrated how the new Israel would succeed where his predecessors had failed. He triumphed over Satan and he modeled Covenant fulfillment. He then gave the LP to his followers as a means by which they would appropriate for themselves all that he had accomplished. The LP was an invitation to become the community of Covenant fulfillment. The new Israel would triumph over evil, just as he himself had done. They would walk in a relationship of trust and dependence. By asking the Father for 'a day's portion of bread each day,' they would demonstrate that they did not live by bread alone, but by the word of YHWH. Their true life and their true sustenance would be in the one whom they addressed as Father. Their hearts would be fully committed to Him, worshiping Him and serving Him alone. They would not put Him to the test, nor would they obligate YHWH to test them. And finally, as they walked in right

[120] In this verse, and that from Lev cited below, I have substituted the ESV 'the Lord' with the tetragrammaton.

relationship with the Father, receiving his forgiveness and grace — they would extend grace and forgiveness to one another.

This is the *particularity* of the new Israel, and it represents a re-configuration of the concept as it was found in the Deuteronomic Covenant. It had been promised that Israel would be exalted among the nations. But Jesus redefined what this would mean. As Wright explains:

> Jesus was announcing that the long-awaited kingdom of Israel's god was indeed coming, but that it did not look like what had been' imagined.' The return from exile, the defeat of evil, and the return of YHWH to Zion were all coming about, but not in the way Israel had supposed. The time of restoration was at hand, and people of all sorts were summoned to share and enjoy it ... Jesus was therefore summoning his hearers to be Israel in a new way, to take up their proper roles in the unfolding drama.[121]

As his kingdom came to earth, YHWH would exalt Israel. All the nations would see His power and His glory manifest among His chosen people, and they would recognize Him as the one true God. But the message of Jesus was that this exaltation of Zion did not consist of military victory or national reconstitution. Rather, the excellence of Israel would first and foremost be manifest in a transformation of the heart. They would love YHWH, trust in Him, and worship Him alone as the one true God. They would love and forgive one another, just as they had received love and forgiveness from the Father. These were the characteristics of the new Israel which Jesus proclaimed.

VI. Conclusion

A. Recapitulation of the Covenant

In the Deuteronomic Covenant the notions of *universality* and *particularity* are interdependent notions. YHWH is the one true God, and the excellence of Israel emanates from her identity as the one nation chosen by Him. Israel is nothing apart from Him, and yet she is the centerpiece of His plan to bless all the families of the earth. Although Israel has stumbled and fallen, she must be raised up. This will happen as she returns to YHWH, obeys His commands, serves Him alone, and walks

[121] Wright (1996a), 201.

in relationship with Him. Then, and only then, will the nations see her excellence. As a faithful Israel is blessed above all others, the nations will then choose to serve her King and YHWH will be universally acknowledged as the one and only God.

This paradigm of the Covenant is one of the most consistently expressed themes in all of ancient Jewish literature. It is woven throughout the Torah, the Psalms, the Prophets, the Apocrypha, the Pseudepigrapha, Philo, the Dead Sea Scrolls and the prayers of the Talmud. The longings to see Israel made holy, for the poor to be blessed, for the tribes to return, for the oppressor to be crushed, and for YHWH's glory to cover the earth are expressed again and again. And yet throughout these texts, Israel's hope never seems to materialize. Prayers and expectations, dreams, visions and prophesies are spoken from generation to generation, and yet the time of fulfillment always seems to elude her.

Jesus came announcing that the long awaited day had arrived. Previously, Israel's exile had come about due to her failure to honor the Covenant. He now came to fulfill the pact on her behalf, and to lead her into a new righteousness. The excellence to which Israel aspired was now available through him. He invited them to call upon YHWH as 'Father,' thus giving them a share of his relationship with Him. Through Jesus, and in adherence to his teaching the new Israel would come into being. The LP was thus a prayer of Covenant renewal. Those who prayed it would affirm YHWH as the one true God, even as they would affirm their own identity as the chosen people of God who would display His honor to all the nations.

B. *Continuity and Discontinuity*

The proclamation of Jesus was indeed revolutionary. But for those who believed in him, it was an upheaval that had been long-awaited. Jesus and his early followers proclaimed that Moses, the prophets and all of Scripture had spoken of his coming.[122] The *kerygma* of the early church was that Jesus had fulfilled the Covenant on behalf of Israel.[123] Thus,

[122] Lk 24:47: 'And he said to them, "O foolish ones, and slow of heart to believe all that the prophets have spoken! Was it not necessary that the Christ should suffer these things and enter into his glory?" And beginning with Moses and all the Prophets, he interpreted to them in all the Scriptures the things concerning himself.'

See also Act 2:22-36; 13:16-39.

[123] Cf. Mt 5:17-18; Lk 24:44; Jn 1:17; Rom 5:9-21; Rom 10:1-13; Gal 3:10-14.

what Jesus brought to the Jews was new and radical — but at the same time, it was hoped-for by many.

Whether or not the proclamation of Jesus constituted continuity with the historical Deuteronomic Covenant is a matter of theological perspective. To be sure, he had to redefine the predominant Messianic expectations of his day. But even this aspect of his proclamation did not necessarily signify discontinuity with prophecy. The majority of first-century Jews may have hoped for a political liberator and a terrestrial king. But the DSS and other period texts suggest that there was a broad diversity of Messianic expectations. For example, 4Q521 speaks of a deliverer whose mission was characterized by his compassion to the poor and his power to raise the dead.[124] The 'Son of Joseph' tradition tells of a suffering Messiah who ultimately dies and is resurrected after three days.[125] And Enoch spoke of a Messiah who would be worshiped and blessed by all who dwell on the earth.[126] Thus, there was no single set of Messianic hopes in first-century Palestine. Whether Jesus was a blasphemer or the Chosen One was largely a matter of the Messianic doctrine to which one prescribed. It can be said that the proclamation of Jesus stood in continuity with some expectations, even as it defied oth-

[124] 4Q521 reads: 'For the hea]vens and the earth shall listen to His Messiah [and all w]hich is in them shall not turn away from the commandments of the holy ones ... For He will honor the pious upon the th[ro]ne of His eternal kingdom, setting prisoners free, opening the eyes of the blind, raising up those who are bo[wed down ... For He shall heal the critically wounded, He shall revive the dead. He shall send good news to the afflicted.' [Abegg (2008), 530]

[125] Knohl (2008), 60, remarks: 'In some texts from around the turn of the era, we encounter Joseph as a son of God who atones for the sins of others with his suffering. For example, in *Joseph and Aseneth*, written between 100 BCE and 115 CE Joseph is described as "son of God" (6:3, 5, 13:13). Joseph is also called "God's firstborn son" (18:11, 21:4, 23:10). In another book from the Second Temple period, *The Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs*, the Testament of Benjamin connects Joseph and the figure of the Suffering Servant in Isaiah 52-53. In this testament, Jacob says to Joseph: "In you will be fulfilled the heavenly prophecy, which says that the spotless one will be defiled by lawless men and *the sinless one will die for the sake of impious men*" (emphasis supplied). These citations suggest that the designation of the suffering Messiah as the "son of Joseph" goes back to sources from the Second Temple period.' Knohl (2008), 60, also suggests that the recently discovered inscription known as 'Gabriel's Revelation' offers further attestation to a turn-of-the-era tradition in which the son of Joseph is killed and resurrected. He comments that the text of the stone 'seems to predict that in three days the evil will be defeated by the righteous ... "By three days you shall know that thus said the Lord of Hosts, the God of Israel, the evil has been broken by righteousness" (Lines 19-21) ... Line 80 begins with the phrase "In three days"... Gabriel the archangel is giving orders to someone to "live": "In three days, you shall live." In other words, in three days, you shall return to life (be resurrected).'

[126] 1 En. 48:4-7 (cited above).

ers. The exclusivity which Jesus claimed for himself was surely a source of offense to those who did not share his conceptualization of the Messianic mission. However, for those who did share his Messianic doctrine, it was fitting and appropriate.

In sum, the understanding of the Deuteronomic Covenant as expressed in the LP is broadly in line with that which is found throughout ancient Jewish literature. What made the proclamation of Jesus (embodied in this prayer) so unique was his claim of Covenant fulfillment. To those who shared his Messianic vision, this was a natural progression of the promises and prophesies that had been passed down over many centuries. It was the ultimate expression of continuity. For many other Jews, however, Jesus' Messianic claim was a blasphemous aberration.[127]

[127] See Mt 26:65; Mk 14:64; Lk 5:21; Jn 10:33.

CHAPTER THREE: THE LORD'S PRAYER IN THE GOSPEL OF MATTHEW

I. Introduction

Thus far, we have considered the LP as it would have been understood during the early stages of its oral transmission. We have analyzed the historical and theological context in which Jesus lived and taught, and we have constructed a plausible interpretation of the prayer in that light. As we now approach the Gospel of Matthew, we have the opportunity to deal with it in more concrete terms. This Gospel was the earliest written record of the LP, and thus we view Matthew as its first interpreter.

By the time Matthew wrote his text, a form and praxis had been established for the recitation of the LP,[1] and a corpus of teaching accompanied its transmission. His Gospel bears the marks of a community that prayed the LP regularly and incorporated its message into their theology and corporate life. The themes of this prayer are predominant throughout the entire narrative, and it has oft been noted that the structure Sermon on the Mount, in particular, is patterned after the LP.[2]

As with all Gospel authors Matthew wrote with a certain 'agenda,' and the LP played an essential role in its conveyance. There are specific lines of theology in this text that radiate from his understanding of this prayer. It is in the exploration of these thematic *rays* that the distinctiveness of Matthew's interpretation is revealed. By looking at the way he redacted his sources, the literary structure of his Gospel, and his theological and ecclesiological emphases, we discover a unique understanding

[1] Luz (1989), 10, 50, argues that Matthew's version of the LP is in fact the form of the prayer that he received. I concur with this assessment.

[2] C.f. Luz (1989), 10.

of the LP. To a significant degree, his interpretation stood in continuity with the earliest traditions. But we also see that Matthew was not unwilling to inject new meaning into the words of this prayer. It is the new and unique characteristics of his interpretation that will be our focus in this present chapter.

In Matthew, the LP is about heaven and earth. It is a prayer that illuminates the contrast and the tension between these two realms. Yet it also envisions the time when the separation between them will cease to exist — the day when heaven and earth will be transformed, and all of creation will enter into a glorious *new genesis*. Matthew's message is that by the power of this prayer, heaven comes to earth and good triumphs over evil. It is a prayer that moves both God and man into action, and fosters the collaboration between them that is essential to the fulfillment of its vision.

Just as heaven and earth dominate his rendering of the LP, so these notions resonate throughout the entire text. Matthew's comprehensive strategy is to highlight the distinction and the tension that exist between these realms. In his cosmology, the separation of heaven and earth is the unnatural consequence of sin and rebellion. The formative *ecclesia*[3] is a community that straddles both realities. They fight the battle against evil, in both its ethical and supernatural manifestations. Through their prayers, their ethos of righteousness, and the exercise of their authority, the followers of Jesus collaborate with the Father in the process that will ultimately result in the union of heaven and earth.

As we explore the meaning of the LP in Matthew, our first step will be to survey the author's use of the *heaven and earth* leitmotif.[4] Analysis of his redaction and literary style will reveal that he was rather deliberate in incorporating this theme into his work. We will then proceed to study the theological significance of *heaven and earth* within Matthew's worldview, and its bearing upon his ecclesiology. Finally, we shall look specifically at how the LP serves as the recapitulation of Matthew's *heaven and earth* theology.[5]

[3] In this chapter, I will predominantly use this transliteration in lieu of 'church,' as the latter term tends to carry connotations that are anachronistic to the text.

[4] It is noted that the present aim is not to offer a comprehensive exegesis of the LP in Matthew. Rather, our attention will focus on those specific elements of this prayer that were particularly important to him, as demonstrated by their thematic emphasis in his text.

[5] It may be beneficial at this time to stake out certain aspects of my position on this Gospel. I concur with Luz (1995) (and many others) on the following points: 1) Matthew was a Jewish follower of Jesus; 2) Matthew's communities observed the

II. Redaction and Literary Analysis

Matthew implemented various redactive and literary strategies to emphasize the leitmotif of *heaven and earth.* He supplemented and modified his sources, and introduced his own material — with the intention of making this a central theme of his narrative. His particular use of *heaven and earth* reveals the unique way in which he understood these terms. In order to disambiguate their meaning from other possible understandings, he consistently framed them in opposition to one another. Heaven stands in diametric contrast to the earth, and each illuminates all that the other *is not*.

A. Redaction

In his work *Heaven and Earth in the Gospel of Matthew,* Jonathan Pennington argues that this theme is of major significance in the Gospel. Building his case on the analysis of Matthew's redactive method, he notes the following:

- Twelve times in Matthew's Gospel there appears a conjunctive construction of *heaven and earth.* Several additional pairings are found wherein heaven is conjoined with a synonymous reference to earth. By contrast, this pairing appears only two times in Mark and four times in Luke.[6] In those instances where 'heaven and earth' appear in the other synoptics, the sense is always merismatic (implying universality). Matthew alone uses these terms in a contrastive sense.[7]

Torah; 3) Matthew's primary sources were the Q sayings and the Gospel of Mark; and 4) the provenance of the Gospel was most likely Syria, subsequent to the destruction of the Jerusalem temple in 70 CE. Against Luz, I concur with Saldarini (1994) that: 1) Matthew's communities remained very much within Judaism; 2) The polemic of Matthew was *intra muros,* aimed in particular at the leaders of the Jews and not the nation as a whole; and 3) The mission to Israel remained in play, even as the horizons among the Gentiles were beginning to open. With Bauckham (1998), I would assert that Matthew wrote his Gospel with an eye towards its broad circulation, even as it reflects the needs and concerns of his immediate communities.

[6] Pennington (2007), 4.

[7] Pennington (2007), 72, notes that 'the contrastive pairs are: 5:34-35; 6:10, 19-20; 16:19b,c; 18:18b,c; 18:19; 23:9; 28:18. All of these come from M material with the exception of 6:10 and 6:19-20. However, in 6:10, the heaven and earth phrase is completely missing from the Lukan parallel (11:2), and likewise, no heaven and earth pairing is in view in the Lukan parallel (12:33) to Matt 6:19-20. Thus, all of the heaven and earth contrast pairs in Matthew are unique to his Gospel.'

- Forms of οὐρανός appear in Matthew's Gospel eighty one times, making up over thirty percent of the total appearances of this term in the NT. By comparison, οὐρανός appears only eighteen times in Mark, thirty five times in Luke, and eighteen times in John.[8]
- Matthew expanded Q and Markan material a total of thirty one times. Seventeen of these insertions include the phrase 'kingdom of heaven' which, contrary to many interpretations, is much more than a reverential circumlocution for the 'kingdom of God.'[9] Seven of these (thirty one) expansions incorporate the phrase, 'Father in heaven.'[10]
- The expressions 'Father in heaven' or 'heavenly Father' appear twenty times in Matthew's Gospel. With the exception of Mark 11:25, these expressions appear nowhere else in the NT.[11]

Thus, it is evident in the analysis of Matthew's redaction that the *heaven and earth* leitmotif reflects Matthew's unique theological agenda. He supplemented and modified his sources, and he added his own material in order to make this a central theme in his Gospel.

The question at hand is whether Matthew intended to say something *new* with his usage of *heaven and earth*, or whether he was working with the common interpretation. His readers were obviously very familiar with these terms.[12] It must be discerned whether Matthew sought continuity or discontinuity with regard to the way these words would have been understood.

[8] Pennington (2007), 2.

[9] Pennington (2007), 13-37, lays out a detailed analysis of the circumlocution interpretation, which (he notes) gained favor consequential to the work of Gustaf Dalman in 1902. Pennington argues that 'heaven' served as a potent metonym for God, that was meant to stress the contrast between heaven and earth — and it was not simply a means of avoiding the name of God. Pennington (2007), 321, notes: 'Matthew's choice to regularly depict the kingdom as τῶν οὐρανῶν is designed to emphasize that God's kingdom is not like earthly kingdoms, stands over against them, and will eschatologically replace them (on earth).'

[10] Pennington (2007), 71.

[11] Pennington (2007), 71.

[12] Pennington (2007) 310, notes, 'A study of heaven in the Old Testament and Second Temple literature reveals that heaven and earth was a prominent and important theme throughout the Jewish literature. Beginning with the crucial prolegomenon of Genesis 1:1 and ending with the last verse of the Hebrew Bible (2 Chron 36:23), heaven and earth language permeates the textual traditions preceding and contemporary with Jesus.'

Pennington answer to this question is that Matthew's usage of *heaven* and *earth* is 'idiolectic,' that is, unique to him.[13] Outside of Matthew's text, the word heaven was commonly used as a circumlocution for the name of God.[14] The expression 'heaven and earth' was commonly used (as I have mentioned above) in a merismatic sense.[15] Matthew's intention was to say something different. His usage draws attention to 'the tension that currently exists between heaven and earth, between God's realm and ways and humanity's.'[16] Matthew sought to highlight the fundamental distinction between these realms.

B. *Oppositions*

Daniel Patte has written a 'structural commentary' on Matthew's Gospel in which he focuses his attention on the literary and narrative contrasts or 'oppositions' within the text. In the explanation of his methodology, he notes that we (modern speakers) attempt to avoid misunderstandings when we 'not only state what we want to communicate,' but also 'what we do not mean to say.'[17] In this same way, Patte suggests that Matthew's use of oppositions allowed him to remove any ambiguity from the messages he wished to convey. Matthew had a general tendency to present foils or antitheses to his major motifs, thus giving precision to their meaning. Each opposition in the text serves to 'flag' an area where the author wanted to lead his audience toward a new understanding of familiar terms or images. The clearest examples of Matthew's oppositions are found in the Sermon on the Mount. Jesus there tells his audience that even though they had heard certain things said by other teachers, his teaching was different.[18] And even though many other Jews prayed, fasted and gave alms in one fashion, he instructed them to

[13] Pennington (2007), 6-7: 'A detailed study of the Jewish literary context reveals that Matthew has drawn on semi-developed concepts in his heritage to create an idiolectic way of using the language of heaven. This idiolectic usage consists of four aspects: 1) An intentional distinction in meaning between the singular and plural forms of οὐρανός; 2) The frequent use of the heaven and earth word-pair as a theme; 3) Regular reference to the Father in heaven; and 4) The recurrent use of the uniquely Matthean expression, ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν.'

[14] Cf. Pennington (2007), 13-38.

[15] See Pennington (2007), 39-66, for a complete survey of the use of heaven and earth in the OT and Second Temple literature.

[16] Pennington (2007), 7.

[17] Patte (1987), 6.

[18] Mt 5:17, 21-22, 2728, 33-34, 38-39, 43-44.

perform these acts in another way.[19] In these instances, Jesus built his paraenesis on the basis of how it stood in opposition to that of others.

The h*eaven and earth* motif is used repeatedly in Matthew's oppositional constructions. Some of these are quite obvious, for example: the disciples are told to not to practice their righteousness before other people (on earth), but rather to seek the reward from their Father in heaven.[20] They are told, 'Do not lay up for yourselves treasures on earth... but lay up for yourselves treasures in heaven.' (Mt 6:19-20) Other examples are broader and at times, more subtle. In Mt 23:9 Jesus tells his disciples to 'call no man father on earth, for you have one Father, who is heaven.' This verse epitomizes a broader theme in Matthew wherein the character of the Father in heaven is presented as righteous and compassionate, set in contrast to the predominantly negative portrayal of earthly fathers.[21] In all of these instances, all that heaven signifies is enhanced and clarified by its negative counterpart on earth.

To conclude our overview of Matthew's redactive and literary strategies, we recall our three main points. First, with regard to his redaction, he significantly expanded the text of his sources and added his own material in order to make *heaven and earth* a primary theme of his Gospel. Second, Matthew's use of *heaven* and *earth* was intended to highlight their fundamental difference from one another. His usage stood in discontinuity with the common understanding of his day. Finally, in order to undergird his theological purpose, he frequently employed these terms in the construction of literary oppositions. We now proceed to consider the significance of this theme within Matthew's theology.

III. Matthew's Symbolic Universe

A. Good vs. Evil in Heaven and Earth

Even as heaven and earth are set in contrast to one another, Matthew does not characterize the earth as intrinsically evil. Nor is the earth

[19] Mt 6:1-18

[20] Mt 6:1-2.

[21] Pennington (2007), 238, mentions several passages where this negative contrast is either explicit or inferred: a group of brothers leave their fishing nets in the hands of their father, as they begin to follow Jesus (Mt 4:21-22); another man is invited to become a disciple, but chooses instead to stay with his father (Mt 8:21); Jesus praises his disciples for leaving their fathers (Mt 19:29); and the day will come when earthly fathers will betray their children because they are followers of Christ (Mt 10:21).

presented as a shadow, or an inferior reproduction of heaven.[22] Rather, Matthew's cosmology reflects a traditional reading of the Scriptures. Both heaven and earth form part of the good creation of God.[23] Heaven is the location of God Himself and the spiritual beings that He formed. Earth was created as the dwelling place of humans.[24]

Across these realms, a battle rages between the forces of good and evil. Matthew's characterization of this conflict does not adhere to classical forms of *dualism*, but he does embrace the notion of *duality*.[25] There are two unique expressions of duality found in Matthew, and these stood in continuity with the prevalent apocalyptic eschatology of the Second Temple period.[26] In one form of duality, the battle for dominion of the earth is carried out by God and angels, who wage war against the powers of evil. In the other, the destiny of the nations rests largely upon man, who struggles to choose between ethical good and evil.

The first expression of duality is supernatural in character,[27] emphasizing God's activity in the spiritual realm. Martin de Boer explains:

[22] Pennington (2007), 333 notes: 'Matthew's employment of the motif does not particularly manifest the idea that earthly structures are copies of heavenly realities. In this sense, some distinction can be observed between Matthew's use of the heaven and earth theme and that of the book of Hebrews (e.g., Heb 8:5). In Matthew, heaven is used mainly as a foil for earth, as a means of critiquing what is wrong with the way humans live on the earth, by contrasting the two realms and by looking forward to the eschaton when the tension between the two realms will be resolved. The problem is that sinful earth currently is not in line with heavenly realities (6:9-10) — it is radically different — such that eschatologically, the former will be reinvented by the latter.'

[23] Isa 66:1-2 reads: 'Thus says the Lord: "Heaven is my throne, and the earth is my footstool; what is the house that you would build for me, and what is the place of my rest? All these things my hand has made, and so all these things came to be," declares the Lord.' Matthew utilizes this same imagery in 5:34-35: 'But I say to you, Do not take an oath at all, ether by heaven, for it is the throne of God, or by the earth, for it is his footstool.'

[24] As stated in Ps 115:16: 'The heavens are the LORD's heavens, but the earth he has given to the children of man.'

[25] N. T. Wright (1992), 252-254, describes ten ancient expressions of duality: theological/ontological; theological/cosmological; moral; eschatological; theological/moral; cosmological; anthropological; epistemological; sectarian and psychological. What is often categorized as 'dualism' is what Wright categorizes as 'theological/moral' duality, typified by Zoroastrianism and some forms of Gnosticism, wherein there are two ultimate sources of all that is good and all that is evil, a good god and a bad god.

[26] de Boer (1999) points to various texts from 1 En., 2 Bar., 4 Ez., T. Mos. and Pss. Sol. as examples of the apocalyptic eschatology being formed during this period.

[27] de Boer (1999), 358-359, refers to this expression of duality as 'cosmological.'

> The created world has come under the dominion of evil, angelic powers in some primeval time, namely in the time of Noah ... God's sovereign rights have been usurped and the world, including God's own people, has been led astray into forms of idolatry ... God will invade the world under the dominion of the evil powers and defeat them in a cosmic war. Only God has the power to defeat and to overthrow the demonic and diabolical powers that have subjugated and perverted the earth. God will establish his sovereignty very soon, delivering the righteous and bringing about a new age in which he will reign unopposed.[28]

The second pattern of duality is ethical in character,[29] emphasizing the activity of humans. de Boer again explains:

> The emphasis falls on free will and individual human decisions. Sin is the willful rejection of the Creator God (the breaking of the first commandment), and death is punishment for this fundamental sin. God, however, has provided the law as a remedy for this situation, and a person's posture toward this law determines his or her ultimate destiny.[30]

John Riches refers to these two forms of duality as 'conflicting mythologies.'[31] Utilizing this basic framework, Riches explores the expressions of duality in Matthew's Gospel. He concludes that the author, typical of other period writers, combined these themes freely and without rigor. Neither pattern could make full account for the human situation, and thus the two mythologies were held in dialogue and tension. Riches describes the dilemma that Matthew faced:

> Some account of human responsibility for sin and its overcoming is necessary, if human beings are not to be reduced merely to puppets in the hands of the gods, good or evil. On the other hand, were all responsibility for the present condition of the world to be loaded onto human beings, it would seem to destroy any basis for hope in a future purged of evil. If humanity were in and of itself so corrupt, what possible basis could it provide for a new world freed of sin? Only if some angelic agency is invoked, which can also shoulder the responsibility for the world's

[28] de Boer (1999), 358-359. He goes on to cite 1 En. 1-36 and T. Mos. 10 as examples of this cosmology.

[29] de Boer refers to this expression of duality as 'forensic.'

[30] de Boer (1999), 359. He cites 4 Ez. and 2 Bar. as examples.

[31] Riches (2000).

> ills and which can be overcome by divine intervention, can a view of the future be constructed which provides hope for a restored humanity.[32]

Looking at Matthew's Gospel, the idea of ethical duality is easily discerned. The idea of *righteousness* is a major theme of his narrative: Jesus promises reward for those who hunger and thirst for righteousness;[33] the kingdom belongs to those who are persecuted for sake of righteousness;[34] the righteousness of Jesus' followers must surpass that of the Pharisees;[35] the disciples are called to seek first the kingdom and its righteousness;[36] salvation is not simply for those who call Jesus Lord, but only for those who do the will of the Father.[37]

Supernatural duality is also clearly present in this text. Matthew portrays evil as a pervasive force. Satan has a kingdom[38] and asserts his authority over the kingdoms of the world;[39] evil spirits seek to destroy human lives;[40] it is predicted that evil men will prosper and live their lives without being held to account;[41] the disciples will be persecuted and betrayed, wickedness will increase, wars will be on the rise, false prophets will appear, and abominations will occur.[42] The problem of evil will not be ultimately resolved until the 'end of the age,' when the Son of Man returns to 'weed out of his kingdom everything that causes sin and all who do evil.'(Mt 13:41)[43]

[32] Riches (2000), 53.

[33] Mt 5:6.

[34] Mt 5:10.

[35] Mt 5:20.

[36] Mt 6:33.

[37] Mt 7:20-21. Riches (2000), 197, comments further: 'The centrality which Matthew accords to this understanding of righteousness, with its roots in the hopes for restoration of the people of Israel in Isaiah, places Matthew's Gospel firmly in the tradition of forensic, restorationist eschatology. When the people repent, God will restore them to Zion and they will be free to follow his Law; the nations will see the glory of Zion and will flock to worship God. The emphasis lies clearly on repentance and the freedom of the people to obey or disobey.'

[38] Mt 12:26.

[39] Mt 4:8-9.

[40] Mt 12:45.

[41] Mt 13:24-29; 37-43.

[42] Mt 10:17-24.

[43] Again we cite Riches, (2000), 200: 'Cosmic dualist mythology is certainly present in Matthew's Gospel, but the church, though surrounded by the dark powers is itself a haven from them.'

Thus, as Riches suggest, the ethical and supernatural dualities are both present in Matthew's narrative. But in contrast to the 'conflict' that Riches proposes, we find in Matthew that these dualities actually function in tandem with one another. Matthew sees the present righteousness of the *ecclesia,* and the supernatural intervention of God as interrelated elements within his theological paradigm. The battle between good and evil has an ethical expression in the daily lives of Christians, who must resist sin and choose what is right. At the same time, evil spirits wage war against God and His purposes, and it is God Himself who will ultimately judge and destroy them. The earthly, ethical struggle between good and evil is carried out in the awareness that in the heavenly realm, God sits as the ultimate power and the final judge. *Righteousness* is the ethos implicit to Matthew's eschatological worldview.[44] The 'conflicting mythologies' are not in so much conflict after all.

This correlation between personal ethics and eschatology is clearly seen in the Beatitudes: 'blessed are the meek, for they shall inherit the earth,' (5:6); 'blessed are the merciful, for they will be shown mercy,' (5:7); 'blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God,' (5:8); 'blessed are the peacemakers, for they will called sons of God,' (5:9), etc. Jesus here advocates a present way of living that stands in the light of a future reality.[45] The disciples of Jesus must live in the awareness of God's eventual intervention, knowing that that He will come at future time to reward justice and punish sin.

In summary, we have seen that there is in Matthew a broad pattern of duality which takes on two expressions, ethical and supernatural. The battle between good and evil traverses the realms of heaven and earth, and is fought by both God and man. On earth, men and women are called to live in righteousness. But the ethical code that Matthew presents is predicated on the awareness that God is at war against evil, and

[44] We recall Geertz (1973), 89-90: 'sacred symbols function to synthesize a people's ethos — the tone, character, and quality of their life, its moral and aesthetic style and mood — and their world view — the picture they have of the way things in sheer actuality are, their most comprehensive ideas of order ... Religious symbols formulate a basic congruence between a particular style of life and a specific (if, most often, implicit) metaphysic.'

[45] Many commentators have noted that there are no commands or imperatives in the beatitudes, and argue that they should not be construed as ethical teaching. Guelich (1976), 416-417, notes: 'A beatitude is essentially a declarative sentence, but the nature of the declaration is such that it readily takes on a hortative and paraenetic tone. Consequently, the declaration comes almost as a challenge or summons for the hearers to join in the ranks of the "blessed" by meeting the implicit demands of the statement.'

that He will, in the end, radically intervene in the affairs of men. Therefore, Matthew's ethical imperative is not ontologically ungrounded.[46]

B. The Reconciliation of Heaven and Earth

Having now explored the significance of the ethical and supernatural expressions of duality in Matthew, we now consider how this notion is related to his conceptualization of heaven and earth.[47]

Matthew presents heaven and earth as existing in contrast and tension. Heaven is portrayed as a foil to earth. These realms, however, are not at war with one another. There will be no cataclysmic end to the physical creation, wherein the spiritual realm of heaven triumphs over the material realm of earth. Heaven is not a place to which the faithful 'go,' to spend eternity after the earth has been destroyed.[48] Rather, Matthew envisions a final union of the two realms. Pennington notes:

> For Matthew, this tension has an eschatological resolution; heaven and earth will not always stand in contrast... the goal of God's redemptive plan in Jesus is not the removal of the earth in the sense of being replaced with a kingdom in heaven, but is instead the eschatological reuniting of the heavenly and earthly realms.[49]

[46] From the standpoint of modern anthropology, ethics and morality are generally viewed as being grounded in worldview. This is to say that whether an action is interpreted to be moral, immoral or amoral is determined by a personal or social concept of reality. Geertz (1973), 127, notes: 'An ethics without ontology, we do not in fact seem to have found... The tendency to synthesize world view and ethos at some level, if not logically necessary, is at least empirically cohesive; if it is not philosophically justified, it is at least pragmatically universal'

[47] At the outset of this section, I will comment that there is a temptation to 'cleanly' integrate the theme of *heaven and earth* into the duality of ***good and evil,*** simply by framing earth as the realm of evil, and heaven as the realm of good. Such integration, however, is not consistent with Matthew's thought. Matthew does not view heaven as being at war with the earth. Rather, ***good*** (in its ethical and supernatural expressions) is at war with *evil* (in its ethical and supernatural expressions). The conflict traverses both realms.

[48] Matthew's parable of the seed (Mt 13:24-30, 37-43, a significant expansion of Mark 4:30-32) offers unique insight into Matthew's eschatology. The kingdom's final consummation occurs on earth. In this parable, the 'field' is the world (Mt 13:38) where both the good and bad seeds are planted. At the end of the age, the angels, 'gather out of his kingdom all causes of sin and all law-breakers.'(Mt 13: 41) Thus, at the Parousia, the world (i.e. the earth) is referred to as the locus of the kingdom of Jesus, as well as the kingdom of the Father (Mt 13:43). See also Gundry (1982), 271-274.

[49] Pennington (2007, 210.

This reuniting of heaven and earth will be consummated in a *new genesis* (παλιγγενεσίᾳ).[50]

The author envisions a collaboration, or a partnership between God and man to advance God's kingdom on earth. As we noted above, the interplay of ethical and supernatural dualities in Matthew creates a paradigm in which there is an ethical imperative placed upon humans, even as the ultimate spiritual power is attributed to God. Humans will do their part, and God will do His.

Heaven represents the throne of God. It is the locus of His authority, and the provenance of His initiative. Heaven sets the tone, determines the values, lays out the 'ground rules.' Earth, as the dwelling place of man, is the place where the followers of Jesus will put the Father's will into practice. When this happens, heaven comes to earth. The eschatological union is anticipated in the present age by the righteous living of the *ecclesia.*

This dynamic is evident in Jesus' teaching on the kingdom. The 'secrets of the kingdom of heaven,' (13:11) which he reveals to his disciples are not merely revelations about the future. Rather, they describe how heaven and earth can be brought into union in the present age. They define the ethos by which Jesus wants his disciples to live their lives on earth. When Jesus says, 'the kingdom of heaven is like ...,'[51] or the 'kingdom of heaven can be compared to ...,'[52] what typically follows is a teaching on the nature of the heavenly kingdom as it is manifested on earth.[53] The instruction is to live by faith, to sacrifice all things for God, to forgive, to trust, to be ready. In Matthew's framework, the kingdom of heaven will be manifest on earth as the followers of Jesus walk in this way, and thus carry out the will of the heavenly Father in their earthly lives.

Thus, the reconciliation of heaven and earth begins in the present time. It will find its consummation in the eschaton, when Jesus returns

[50] Mt 19:28.

[51] ὁμοία ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν. See Mt 13:31, 33, 44, 45, 47; 20:1.

[52] ὡμοιώθη ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν. See Mt 13:24; 18:23; 22:2; 25:1.

[53] e.g., the mysterious co-existence of good and evil (Mt 13:24-30); the power of faith (Mt 13:31, 33); the value of salvation (Mt 13:44, 45); the imperative to forgive others (Mt 18:23-35); the generosity of the Father in dealing with his servants (Mt 20:1-16); the importance of living in readiness for the Son's return (Mt 25:1-13). Even when these sayings are merely descriptive of the final judgment (e.g. Mt 13:47-50) they still carry an ethical undertone. Riches (2000), 302, notes that the teaching on the pending judgment would 'undoubtedly significantly constrain action as people weighed "alternative courses of action in terms of likely future considerations."'

to judge sin and eradicate evil. But the righteousness and faith of the *ecclesia* on earth are the prolepsis of the coming union.

C. *The* Ecclesia

We have seen above that the impetus towards the *new genesis* will be driven by both man and God, and the 'battle fronts' include both the heavenly and spiritual realms. The ethical conduct and faith of the *ecclesia* brings heaven to earth. This is one pattern of how Matthew envisions the two realms being brought into union. There is in his Gospel, however, another pattern as well. In this case, the role of the church is more assertive. Two passages in which we see this function described are Peter's declaration of faith in Mt 16:13-20, and the instruction on *binding and loosing* in Mt 18:18-20.

In the first passage, the imagery of heaven and earth are pervasive. Peter declares his faith, after which Jesus proclaims that this revelation is not from 'flesh and blood,' (i.e. from the earth), but from the Father in heaven.[54] Heaven is manifest on earth through Peter's declaration. Jesus then goes on to say that he will build his *ecclesia* upon 'this rock' and that the gates of Hades will not overcome it.[55] In this statement, the two expressions of duality are now in simultaneous operation. The exercise of righteousness is demonstrated through Peter's confession of faith. The supernatural element is evident as Jesus declares that on this faith he will build his *ecclesia*,[56] and that in the spiritual realm, the forces of darkness will not overtake it. Jesus then states that the keys to the kingdom of heaven will be given to Peter, a man on earth. And Jesus concludes saying, 'whatever you bind on earth shall be bound in heaven, and whatever you loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven.' (Mt 16:19)

Historical explanations of what Matthew meant by the *power to bind and loose* vary greatly.[57] Given the context of this passage, wherein Jesus is describing the nature and the authority of the *ecclesia*, it is my posi-

[54] Mt 16:17.

[55] Mt 16:18.

[56] Or that Peter himself is the foundation of the *ecclesia*. The differing interpretations of the Protestant, Catholic and Orthodox traditions do not affect my argument on this point.

[57] Hiers (1987) cites the following interpretations: 1) Releasing from vows; 2) Actions forbidden and permitted; 3) Membership or exclusion from the community; 4) Forgiveness or retention of sins (see Jn 20:23); 5) The authority of Jesus and his disciples to judge the nations (see Mt 10:23, 11:20-24; 19:28). Derret (1983) ascribes to this phrase a halakhic authority to determine what is allowed and what is forbidden.

tion that *binding and loosing* refer to the authority of the disciples to include or exclude members from their community.[58] This also explains the meaning of the 'keys of the kingdom.' The salient point throughout this section, however, is the role attributed to the *ecclesia*.

The *ecclesia* is empowered by God: it receives revelation from the Father, it is edified by Jesus, and it receives authority from Jesus. But the *ecclesia* must also act: it must declare its faith, it must use the keys it receives, it must carefully guard its membership. As the *ecclesia* operates in this fashion, its activities will take effect in both heaven and earth. On earth, the community will grow and be kept pure. In heaven, the community will show its strength against the powers of darkness, and the Father will ratify its determinations. It will be the instrument by which the Father's desire will be advanced in both realms.

A similar depiction of the church is found in Mt 18:15-20. The primary issue in this passage is the internal purity of the community. Jesus instructs his followers how to deal with the problem of 'sin in the camp,' giving them authority to banish the unrepentant. In Mt 16:13-20 Jesus had only addressed Peter. In Mt 18:15-20 he speaks to all of his disciples: 'Truly, I say to you, whatever you bind on earth shall be bound in heaven, and whatever you loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven.'(Mt 18:18) What follows is a reiteration of the *ecclesia's* authority in both the heavenly and earthly realms: 'Again I say to you, if two of you agree on earth about anything they ask, it will be done for them by my Father in heaven. For where two or three are gathered in my name, there am I among them.' (Mt 18:18-19) Here, Jesus is speaking into the future as he addresses specifically the matter of prayer, and he broadens the mandate beyond the simple notion of *binding and loosing*. He says that *whatever* they will agree upon on the earth, will be accomplished by the Father in heaven. This will be possible because he will be in their midst. Through his presence among them, heaven will come to earth.

Throughout Matthew, we have seen his emphasis on the distinction between heaven and earth, as two realms living in tension and in

[58] Such authority would be consistent to that which was later attributed to the Rabbis. Cf. Mishnah Makkot:1:10-12:8 and Strack and Billerbeck (1922), 739a, who favor this reading. It is also consistent with the type of authority that Josephus (*Bellum Judaicum* 1.111) attributed to the Pharisees: 'But these Pharisees ... became themselves the real administrators of the public affairs; they banished and reduced whom they pleased; they bound and loosed [men] at their pleasure.' Finally, the authority to include or exclude members from the community would be the equivalent of forgiving or with-holding sins, and thus consistent with the authority Jesus gave to his disciples in Jn 20:23.

contrast. However, in Mt 16:19 and Mt 18:18-19, heaven and earth are brought into union through the active mediation of the *ecclesia*. The prayers of the *ecclesia* — a human agency empowered by the Father — will have an impact in both heaven and earth. In her, the veil of separation between the two realms will be torn.[59]

IV. The Lord's Prayer in Matthew

Before we look at Matthew's particular understanding of the LP, I will briefly summarize what has been established thus far. Having analyzed the redaction of this Gospel, it has become clear that the *heaven and earth* leitmotif plays a central role in the author's narrative. How this theme fits within Matthew's overall theology is summarized in the following points:[60]

- **a.** Heaven and earth are set in opposition to one another, so that each may be better understood in the light of its counterpart.
- **b.** The tension between heaven and earth will not be resolved by the triumph of one over another, but rather in their reconciliation and ultimate union.
- **c.** The duality of *good against evil* finds two expressions in the Gospel, one which is supernatural in character, the other ethical.
- **d.** The process of reunification between heaven and earth is mediated by the *ecclesia*.

The stage is now set for us to consider how these themes and ideas are recapitulated in the LP.

[59] We find a similar paradigm in John's Revelation. In Rev 5, the scroll in heaven could not be opened apart from the activities of the Lamb, who was slain on earth. The prayers of the saints (Rev 5:5) and the praises of all creatures on earth (Rev 5:13) are also heard in heaven. Shimonowski (2004), 76, notes: 'This "new" (eschatologically oriented) hymn, sung by the four creatures together with the elders, is accompanied by instruments and the offering of "golden bowls." The interpretation of the song as "prayers" indicates once more the close relationship with the heavenly cult, but also with the worship of earthly believers. The content of the song also emphasizes the theme of participation. By their act of worship, the heavenly beings respond to the act of salvation that is symbolized in the Lamb. At this point the earthly worshipers are also involved through their prayers.'

[60] These are not presented in the same order in which they appeared in sections II and III. As we here consider their significance to the LP, I have re-ordered these points in section IV for purposes of flow and organization.

A. Oppositions in the Lord's Prayer

As Matthew set heaven and earth in opposition to one another, he sought to emphasize that there was something fundamentally different between the ways of the Father, as taught by Jesus, and the ways of man. This contrast between heaven and earth, so predominant throughout the Gospel, is also evident in the LP, particularly in its structure. The first three petitions express the plentitude of heaven, whereas the latter four demonstrate the poverty of the earth. True to Matthean form, this dichotomy within the prayer serves to define each realm over against the other. But Matthew's framing of the LP also generates the hope that this tension can be resolved.

In the LP, everything that pertains to God finds its provenance in the heavenly realm. The prayer begins by addressing the Father whose identity is marked by the fact that he dwells in heaven.[61] It continues with three petitions that all relate to Him: 'hallowed be your name;' 'your kingdom come;' 'your will be done.'[62] Throughout the Gospel it has been demonstrated that the subject of each request finds its origin in heaven. Heaven is the locus of God's throne,[63] the setting in which His name is hallowed by those who cry 'holy, holy, holy.'[64] The kingdom in Matthew expressly becomes 'the kingdom of heaven.'[65] And the will of God is articulated as the will of the 'Father in heaven.'[66] Heaven is the origin and the source of all that emanates from the Father.

[61] Πάτερ ἡμῶν ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς (Mt 6:9). Pennington (2007), 87 notes: 'Not only does Matthew prefer to call God Father, but his usage also stands out by regularly connecting God as Father with the idea of heaven. Twenty times Matthew modifies Father with some form of heaven: thirteen times in the phrase ("Father in heaven"), and seven times with the adjectival ("heavenly Father"). "Father in heaven" occurs elsewhere only in Mark 11:25, parallel with one of Matthew's occurrences of v (6:14), in addition to the less exact parallel in Luke 11:13.'

[62] ἁγιασθήτω τὸ ὄνομά σου. ἐλθέτω ἡ βασιλεία σου. γενηθήτω τὸ θέλημά σου (Mt 6:9-10). Wenham (2010), 380, notes the following characteristics of these petitions: 1) They relate to God; 2) They have four words; 3) They contain a third person imperative, followed by the subject and the genitive pronoun 'of you.'

[63] Mt 5:34; 23:22.

[64] Isa 6:3. Matthew does not make explicit reference in his Gospel to this passage, but his Jewish readers would no doubt have made this association. The continuity of this tradition is attested by Rev 4:2-11, where John describes a vision very similar to that of Isaiah, where angels around the throne pronounce the *trisagion*.

[65] The expression 'kingdom of heaven' is unique to Matthew. It appears thirty two times in his Gospel. We have noted above that seventeen of these appearances occur as expansions or modifications of Q and Marcan material.

[66] Cf. Mt 7:21; 12:50.

In contrast, the earth is a place of need. This notion is implicit in the last four petitions of the LP: 'give us this day our daily bread;' 'and forgive us our debts;' 'and lead us not into temptation;' 'but deliver us from evil.'[67] On the earth we see man's vulnerability: his daily need for bread, his tendency to sin, his (implicit) difficulty in forgiving others, his proneness to temptation, and his susceptibility to the powerful influence of evil. Matthew has depicted all of these as base struggles, which distract women and men from the kingdom of heaven. The concern for clothing, and the preoccupation with tomorrow's bread, are characterized as the anxieties of Gentiles.[68] It is the unrighteous who struggle to forgive.[69] The people of the world are castigated for their weakness in temptation[70] and their proclivity towards evil.[71] Earth, in contrast to heaven, is a place of need, of want, and of frailty.

Throughout his Gospel, Matthew has juxtaposed the contrasting realms of heaven and earth. The purpose of this literary device is to draw his readers into the internal tension of the created order. But he has also conveyed a cause for optimism: heaven and earth will be brought into union. This conflict, and the hope of its resolution are encapsulated in the LP. The essence of this prayer is that the fullness of heaven will supply the need of the earth, and that the two realms will become one.

B. As in Heaven, so on Earth

The first and second sections of the LP are bridged by the words, 'on earth as it is in heaven.' (Mt 6:10) For Matthew, this phrase is the focal point of the prayer, both structurally and theologically. We have noted above that the first three petitions of the LP pertain to heaven, and the last four petitions pertain to the earth. While it is commonly thought that 'on earth as it is in heaven' corresponds to the third petition ('your will be done'),[72] it is in fact a bridge between the two sections of the

[67] τὸν ἄρτον ἡμῶν τὸν ἐπιούσιον δὸς ἡμῖν σήμερον. καὶ ἄφες ἡμῖν ⸀τὰ ὀφειλήματα⸀ ἡμῶν. καὶ μὴ εἰσενέγκῃς ἡμᾶς εἰς πειρασμόν. ἀλλὰ ῥῦσαι ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ τοῦ πονηροῦ (Mt 6:11-13).

[68] Cf. Mt 6:25-34.

[69] See Mt 18:22-35.

[70] 'Woe to the world for temptations to sin!' (Mt 18:7)

[71] See Mt 7:11; 9:4; 12:34, 39; 15:19; 16:4.

[72] On the views of various commentators, see Pennington (2007), 99.

prayer.[73] What these words signify is that heaven and earth must be brought into harmony. All that which emanates from the Father in heaven has to be realized upon the earth. Heaven is the place of provenance, while earth is the place of need. Matthew holds to the hope that the earth will not be discarded and destroyed, but rather transformed and renewed. Ultimately, heaven and earth will become one.

Modern exegesis of the phrase 'on earth as it in heaven' often carries a quasi-platonic slant,[74] wherein heaven is presented as the 'analogue' of what the earth is supposed to be. Such a reading, however, is deficient for several reasons. First, we note that there are alternative translations of ὡς ἐν οὐρανῷ καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς. These include: 'both in heaven and on earth;' 'as on earth, so in heaven;' and, 'as in heaven, so on earth.'[75] The grammatical construction of ὡς and καὶ simply indicates equality or similarity between the two things being compared, and does not establish one as the precedent or the model for the other.[76] Second, if our aim is a Jewish reading of the LP, the vision expressed therein must be the equal union of heaven and earth, and not the prevailing of one over the other. Deissler has noted that, 'In principle, it is better, in Old Testament interpretation, to give preference in analogous cases to the typically Hebraic "both-and" over an "either-or," unless there is proof to the contrary.'[77]

Finally, we note that the 'analogue' model exegetically misses the mark in that fails to account for what Matthew has presented as the

[73] There is nothing in the grammatical construction of this phrase that ties it to the third petition. Crossan (2010), 48-49, argues that the phrase 'as in heaven so on earth,' is a hinge between two sections of the prayer that creates a 'poetic parallelism.' He combines the last two petitions of the prayer into one, thus presenting three petitions on each side of this phrase. He notes, 'the first half of the prayer is framed by a phrase about heaven and the next half opens with a mention of the earth.' (49)

[74] Overman (1990), 131, offers an example of this erroneous Platonic reading of the LP: 'The Matthean community understands itself in certain respects as the reflection and embodiment of the kingdom which is in heaven. The Matthean social reality has in some way become closely identified with the ultimate reality of the kingdom of heaven. There is parallelism between the behavior and the will of the Matthean community and the will of God in the kingdom of heaven ... This claim on the part of Matthew for his community is summed up in the uniquely Matthean an phrase, "on earth as it is in heaven." This is an obvious expression of the belief that everything here below has its heavenly analogue up above. In Matthew's version of the Lord's Prayer, the desire and conviction are that the community should embody and reflect the kingdom which is in heaven here and now.'

[75] See Thompson (1959).

[76] C.f. Mt 6:12, 20:14, 24:38-39; Acts 11:17, 13:33, 17:28; 1 Cor 7:7, 9:5; Eph 5:23; 2 Tim 3:9; Heb 3:2; 2 Pet 2:1; Rev 3:21, 18:6.

[77] Deissler (1978), 10.

final reconciliation of heaven and earth. The phrase ὡς ἐν οὐρανῷ καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς is the pivotal clause between the first and second sections of the prayer, and functions to thematically unite heaven and earth.[78] The first three petitions illuminate the glory of the Father who is heaven. The second set of petitions portrays the plight of man on earth. Placed in between these two realms is a plea for the supremacy of the Father to be manifest equally in both. The expression ὡς ἐν οὐρανῷ καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς evokes the vision of reconciliation. The initiatives of the Father in heaven, and the actions of the *ecclesia* on earth are leading both realms toward union. As Pennington notes:

> For Matthew, the current tension or contrast between heaven and earth is not part of God's creative and redemptive plans. The great Christian prayer is that the disjuncture between the two realms will cease to be: God's Name will be hallowed, his will done, and his kingdom manifested not only in the heavenly realm but also in the earthly. This is important because when emphasizing the contrast between heaven and earth it would be a mistake to understand this as a permanent and divinely designed state. The contrast between heaven and earth is a result of the sinfulness of the world and is thus unnatural. The eschatological goal, according to 6:9-10, is that this unnatural tension will be resolved into the unity of God's reign over heaven and earth. As the entire Gospel seeks to show, it is in Jesus Christ that the eschatological reuniting of heaven and earth has begun (cf. especially 28:18), and it will be consummated at his Parousia.[79]

Structurally and theologically, the expression 'on earth as it is in heaven' is the centerpiece of the prayer. It conveys a vision for heaven and earth being brought into harmony. The LP does not depict heaven as the 'analogue' of the earth. Earth will not be subsumed in heaven, or simply dissipate in the coming eschaton. Rather, both realms are in movement toward their eschatological union.

C. *Expressions of Duality*

Even as the LP holds out a vision for the union of heaven and earth, a question that must be explored is the nature of its efficacy. Namely, does

[78] Many commentators [see Pennington (2007), 99] note that this clause modifies the first three petitions. My position, similar to Crossan, is that 'as in heaven so on earth' serves as a 'hinge' for the entire prayer.

[79] Pennington (2007), 155.

Matthew see the effectiveness of prayer being constituted in its power to change human behavior? Or does it lie in its ability to persuade God, and spur Him into action?

The supernatural duality in Matthew concerns the spiritual conflict between God and the forces of evil. It emphasizes the necessity of divine power to judge and eradicate evil. In this system of thought, the power of prayer is effected in the spiritual realm. Alternatively, the ethical duality concerns sin and righteousness, and emphasizes the significance of man's right choices in bringing about the renewal of the earth. From this perspective, the ultimate benefit of prayer is the outcome that it produces in people.

We have noted above that Matthew integrates these patterns of duality freely and without rigor. This enmeshment also characterizes his interpretation of the LP. He viewed the efficacy of this prayer as being constituted both ethically and supernaturally. The roles of God and man are mutually significant in bringing about the fulfillment of its petitions.

With regard to the idea of supernatural duality, we note that this text is, as *a prayer,* is a form of addressing the Deity. Matthew does not conceive of the LP merely as recitation of doctrine, nor a spiritual 'pep talk.' He has made it clear throughout his work that prayer moves God to action: 'If two of you agree on earth about anything they ask, it will be done for them by my Father in heaven;'(18:19) 'Ask and it will be given to you; seek, and you will find; knock, and it will be opened to you;' (Mt 7:7) etc. As the community recites the LP, asking God for bread, for forgiveness, for victory over the enemy and for freedom from testing — they can fully expect God to act on their behalf.

But there is also an ethical commitment which the community affirms as it prays. The onus for action does not lie entirely upon God. Everything that the *ecclesia* envisions for the world — as articulated in the first three petitions of the LP — must be practiced in their own lives.[80] They cannot ask for God's name to be sanctified on the earth if it is not sanctified in them.[81] They cannot ask for the kingdom to come if they

[80] Luz (1995), 50: 'The Lord's Prayer is ... a prayer that includes the actions of human beings and virtually makes those actions its contents. Without mankind's obedience to the will of God it is no more conceivable that his "will be done" than that his "name be hallowed."'

[81] Cf. Mt 5:16: 'In the same way, let your light shine before others, so that they may see your good works and give glory to your Father who is in heaven.'

themselves do not seek righteousness.[82] And they cannot ask for the Father's will to be done on earth if they themselves do not put it into practice.[83] Heaven must be manifest in their own lives before it can take its hold on the earth.

This ethical imperative continues into the second section of the prayer. They must extend forgiveness one another.[84] They must share their bread with one another.[85] They must commit themselves not to test God by repeating the sins of Israel.[86] In all these things, the demand for human action is clear. Luz notes, 'The Lord's Prayer is a prayer of active and obedient men and women, not of those who let their hands rest in their laps and direct their gaze humbly upward. Matthew's main concern is not only that "Need teaches to pray" ... but equally that "Action teaches to pray."'[87]

In sum, we find in the LP that the two dualities are fully integrated. The efficacy of this prayer is not limited to its impact on God, nor is it merely a motivational tool for men. It envisions God and man working together to bring about His kingdom on the earth. Crossan concludes:

> God's kingdom did not, could not, and will not begin, continue, or conclude without human collaboration. It will not happen by divine intervention alone — neither to start, continue, or conclude. That is why Matthew's Abba Prayer has two even parts with the divine 'you' in the first half and the human 'we' in the second half. And those two parts are correlatives. They come together or never come at all. They are like two sides of the same eschatological coin.[88]

[82] Cf. Mt 6:33: 'But seek first the kingdom of God and his righteousness, and all these things will be added to you.'

[83] Cf. Mt 7:21: 'Not everyone who says to me, "Lord, Lord," will enter the kingdom of heaven, but the one who does the will of my Father who is in heaven;' and Mt 12:50: 'For whoever does the will of my Father in heaven is my brother and sister and mother.'

[84] This notion is then reiterated in Mt 6:14-15.

[85] God's provision to one was His provision for all. Ayo (1992), 66, notes: 'We might say: Give us our daily bread as we give daily bread to others. May we receive the love of God so that we may love our neighbor as ourselves.' Matt 25:35 also reiterates the fundamental obligation of the community members to share their bread with one another.

[86] Cf. Deut 6:16: 'You shall not put the LORD your God to the test, as you tested him at Massah.'

[87] Luz (1995), 50.

[88] Crossan (2010), 94.

Thus, the union of heaven and earth that Matthew envisions will not come about by the activity God alone, nor by humans alone. The efficacy of LP lies in the fact that it draws both God and man into collaborative interaction.

D. *The Mediatory Role of the* Ecclesia

The final characteristic of Matthew's theology that we find present in the LP is the precise role that he ascribes to the *ecclesia* as a bridge between the two realms. Both Mt 16:19 and 18:18 state that what the church binds or looses on earth will be bound or loosened in heaven. The significance of this idea is that the possibility exists for initiative on the earth.[89] There can be 'movement' from earth to heaven, just as there is from heaven to earth. What the church does on earth has an effect in heaven, even as the activity of the Father in heaven also has an effect on earth. On Jacob's ladder the traffic moves two ways.

There are multiple ways that Matthew envisions the church exercising its authority to bind and loose. One is with regard to the control over its membership. The *ecclesia* admits or excludes people from the fold — and thus extends, or withholds the forgiveness of sin. One of the outward signs by which the Matthean communities ratified and maintained their membership was through participation in the LP.[90] Matthew's framing of the LP makes it very clear that for him, this was the prayer of the faithful. Those who would pray in this way committed themselves to an ethical standard and a specific doctrine of the kingdom. Participation in the prayer was, in effect, a declaration of forgiveness. These expectations and privileges could not be extended to the

[89] Against Gundry (1982), 335, who argues that the periphrastic future perfect tense implies that what is bound and loosed on earth 'will have been' bound or loosed in heaven. In other words, the *ecclesia* does in the present age what God has already determined. Gundry's reading strains the Greek grammar, and is more dogmatic than exegetical.

[90] By the late second century, it was an established practice in the church that converts to the faith could not participate in the recitation of the LP until they had been baptized. Both Tertullian and Cyprian incorporated instruction on the LP into their training of catechumens, indicating that the candidates would not recite it until after baptism, [see Stewart-Sykes (2004), 22-33]. *Constitutiones apostolicae* 7:44 states that the LP was to be recited after a man or a woman emerged from the baptismal waters. The *Traditio apostolica* of Hippolytus 22:5 declares that individuals are not allowed to pray with the community of the faithful until after their baptism. Although Matthew does not explicitly prescribe this custom, the theological framework of his Gospel makes it very plausible that, at least in a primitive form, the *ecclesia* of his day also held to this practice.

un-baptized, nor to those not in right-standing with the community. Participation in the LP was a means by which the church on earth identified those people on earth who had forgiveness in heaven.

But the *ecclesia*'s capacity to traverse the heavenly and earthly realms extends beyond the functions of *binding* and *loosing*. Jesus tells his disciples that *whatever* they agree upon here on earth, will be done by the Father in heaven. Through the LP, Jesus challenges his followers to aspire for great things: the universal honoring of YHWH's name, the coming of His kingdom and the accomplishment of His will, the provision of bread, the forgiveness of sin, victory over testing and triumph over evil. It is the agreement upon these petitions on earth that will move heaven to action.

Jesus is inviting his followers to be players in the eschatological unfolding of the Father's plan. He promises that after his departure, he will be in their midst when they gather. Heaven will be present on earth, and the *ecclesia* on earth will make its presence felt in heaven. This community of empowered believers, through participation in the LP, straddles heaven and earth. They mediate the tension, praying and working toward the final reconciliation of these two realms.

E. The Pattern of the Lord's Prayer in Matthew

In the first section of this chapter, we analyzed the redaction of Matthew to discover that the *heaven and earth* leitmotif plays a central role in this Gospel. It was seen that Matthew developed this theme by means of various literary devices and thematic emphases. These included the presentation of heaven and earth as standing in opposition to one another, the vision cast for their ultimate union, the presentation of dualistic conflict traversing both realms, and an ecclesiology wherein the *ecclesia* plays a meditative role between them.

This framework, which Matthew implemented throughout his entire Gospel, was patterned after what he observed in the LP. We have seen that:

- **a.** This oppositional contrast between heaven and earth is particularly evident in structure of the prayer. The first three petitions reveal the abundance of heaven, while the latter four demonstrate the poverty of the earth.
- **b.** The phrase, 'on earth as it is in heaven,' a literary bridge between the two sections of the prayer, becomes a theological bridge pointing to the union of the two realms.

c. The LP embraces both expressions of duality found in Matthew. It calls upon God in heaven to act on behalf of humanity, and give them victory over evil in the spiritual realm. Yet is also speaks of a human, ethical responsibility to walk in righteousness, putting into practice all that the prayer envisions for life and practice.
d. The LP is the *de facto* tool of the *ecclesia* to bind and loose on earth that which will bound or loosed in heaven. It is a prayer that envisions the union of heaven and earth, and which effectively moves both realms toward this *telos*.

Thus, the centrality of the LP within this Gospel becomes quite evident. The presentation of *heaven and earth* in the LP became a major emphasis in his text.

V. Conclusion

In Matthew's cosmology, heaven is the dwelling place of God, and earth is the dwelling place of man. This simple contrast is employed as an emblematic leitmotif that not only describes the physical aspects of the created order, but has ethical implications as well. Heaven represents the ways of God and earth represents the ways of man. By making the ethical choice to walk in the ways of heaven, the *ecclesia* participates in the process by which heaven comes to earth, making the two into one. Thus, Matthew advocates a transformative ethos. By following the teachings of Jesus, the disciples have the opportunity to collaborate with the Father in the creation of a new cosmological order.

Matthew's presentation of the LP demonstrates a concern for both the beliefs and the moral conduct of his communities. The conflicting 'mythologies' of ethical and supernatural duality are integrated. Through the lens of Matthew's Gospel, the LP is a prayer for righteousness rooted in eschatological conviction. The orants call upon the Father to strengthen them in the moral struggle against sin and evil, even as they ask Him to defeat the spiritual forces of wickedness. It is a prayer of warfare in the heavenly and earthly realms. Its function is to align the community ethic with its ontology; to legitimate the worldview to which it ascribes, and reinforce the ethos that was consequential to such a belief system. The reward, or outcome of their alignment will be a *new genesis* of the created order.

The LP validates the community's identity and its purpose. Matthew views the *ecclesia* as playing a meditative role in the union of heaven and earth. When the *ecclesia* prays the LP — Jesus is in their midst. What they ask for on earth will be brought to pass by the Father in heaven. They are not simply bystanders in the unfolding of the Father's plan to reconcile all things to Himself. They are players. They are given authority to move and to take action in the heavenly and earthly realms. They are people of consequence.

Matthew took great care to shape the meaning of *heaven and earth* toward the articulation of these ideas. His particular use of this motif was unique and without precedent in the period literature. Consequently, his interpretation of the LP stands alone in many respects.

When one considers the 'individual parts' of the LP in Matthew, the meanings of various words and phrases were not innovatory. His usage of *the name of God*, the kingdom, the will of God, bread, trespasses, testing and evil, was broadly consistent with the literature of the Second Temple period and the NT texts. Even the individual characteristics of heaven and earth within Matthew were fairly standard. What made Matthew's presentation of the LP unique was the contrast and tension that he created between the two realms; and the intrinsic movement in the prayer toward their reunification.[91]

[91] This particular focus within Matthew's text, and his interpretation of the LP is significant to the quest for the *Sitz im Leben* of Matthew. Was the church losing hope that change could be effected in the earthly realm? Were they resigning themselves to social marginalization, and simply setting all their hopes on the heavenly kingdom? Did Matthew's emphasis on the future union of heaven and earth come in response to gnostic influences? Were moral lapses in the church being justified because they were merely *earthly*? Did Matthew consider *heaven* and *earth* as synonyms for *spirit* and *flesh*? All of these are possibilities, and merit further research.

CHAPTER FOUR: THE LORD'S PRAYER IN THE *DIDACHE*

I. Introduction

The *Didache* is unique among the documents in which we find the text of the LP, in that it opens the window on early Christians employing this prayer in their everyday lives. No other early manuscript allows us to see the picture so clearly: we imagine old Jewish men discussing the meaning of each petition with their young Gentile disciples; women emerging from the waters of baptism, and joining their spiritual family to recite this prayer for the first time; children praying the LP each morning as they rise, again in the afternoon, and then one last time before they retire. And we see house fellowships gathered on the Lord's Day, praying the LP in antiphon, spontaneously amplifying and personalizing each petition.

Whereas the *Didache* is not devoid of theology and ecclesiology, its primary purpose was to serve as a manual for the training of Gentile catechumens, and to provide guidelines for community life. The LP was an essential element within the *Didache*'s program of discipleship. For new converts, the recitation of this prayer was central to the rite of initiation. For faithful members of the community, the LP was the most predominant of their daily rituals.[1] It was the recapitulation of their worldview,

[1] Draper (2000), 145, notes, 'The recital of the Lord's Prayer immediately after the baptism may well serve as a concrete symbol of this ritually imparted knowledge, intended for the re-socialization of the neophyte. It is intended as a continual summary and reinforcement of the initiation process through its daily recital, a continual "eating" of the knowledge imparted in initiation, like the daily bread for which it petitions God.'

and an essential tool in reinforcing the ethos by which they were called to live.

Although the *Didache* was 're-discovered' more than 125 years ago, insufficient scholarly attention has been given to the centrality of LP within this text. Often treating it as the interpolation of a late redactor,[2] very few *Didache* analysts have made a serious attempt to integrate this prayer into the thematic and theological flow of the text. Our present study will reveal, however, that far from being a late aggregation, the *Didache* displays an *awareness* of the LP through-and-through. Jonathan Draper has asserted that, 'The Lord's Prayer was not added to the *Didache* at a later stage, but forms an integrated part of its structure.'[3] The content of the LP was central to the theological framework of the *Didache*, and the its recitation essential to its program of discipleship.

Given the centrality of the LP within the *Didache*, there is ample opportunity to discover how it was understood by these particular Christians. There is no doubt that their interpretation would have held much in common with their contemporaries in other Christian communities. But the text also reveals that their understanding of this prayer had a unique flavor, which emanated from their own self-identity. The people that used the *Didache* embraced what can be called a *spirituality of the road*. They viewed themselves as a people moving toward perfection, with a long path in front of them. They experienced moments of messiness and chaos. Yet they believed that the Way of Life had been clearly set before them; God was in their midst, and He was making them holy. The recitation of LP was the most pervasive of their rituals, and it was the primary mechanism for instilling and maintaining a sense of corpo-

[2] e.g., Jefford (1989), 105: 'Yet here the prayer does not make a smooth transition into the text, unlike the ready context in which the prayer is discovered in Math 6:9-13. The insertion of the prayer into ***Did***. 8 instead seems to reflect the desire of the redactor to incorporate new materials into the authoritative tradition of the community, regardless of the violence to the flow of the text that results from this intrusion.'

[3] Draper (2000), 136. Draper seems to have evolved on this issue. He initially argued [Draper (1996c), 85] that, '***Did***. 8 appears to be a later addition to the earliest text of the Didache ... It breaks up the natural flow in the catechetical manual from baptism to the eucharist.' He later [Draper (2000), 136] clarified: 'At first sight, it seems that chapter 8 has been inappropriately interpolated between material on baptism and eucharist in a later redaction, and that it interrupts the flow of the ritual ... However, there is a remarkable unity of structure and symbolism between the Lord's Prayer (8:2) and the eucharistic prayers, which indicates that the Lord's Prayer itself is not an insertion and may even have been first formulated in the context of initiation. Polemical additions and revisions of the framework made in the service of Christian self-definition have obscured the underlying unity perhaps, but the prayer itself belongs with the earlier material.'

rate identity. The LP recapitulated the foundational elements of their worldview and ethos: the sacrality of the community, the coming restoration, the ethical commitment to righteousness, the responsibility to share, the need for ongoing confession and mercy, and the imperative to overcome evil and sin.

Our purpose in this chapter is to uncover the way the *Didache* communities would have interpreted the LP. To accomplish this, we will look first at the particular ethos which characterized their program of discipleship. Then, we will look at the LP within the context of the *Didache*, producing an exegesis of the prayer based on its internal framework.

II. Order and Chaos in the *Didache*

A. Navigating the Tension

The *Didache* communities formed part of the rich and diverse tapestry of first-century Christianity. The text itself bears much in common with other early traditions: the language at times resembles that of John,[4] the sayings of Jesus are among those also recorded by Matthew,[5] and many of the concerns addressed within the *Didache* were shared by Paul.[6] Yet there is no conclusive evidence that the *Didache* was dependent on any of these literary traditions. Rather, the independence of this text is affirmed time-and-time-again by the way it uniquely interprets and applies the traditions that it shared with other Christian communities.[7] The *Didache* represents one among many early expressions of the Christian faith. The leaders of these fellowships held closely to their Judaic heritage, and consequently, the *Didache* tells us as much about first-century Judaism as is does about early Christianity.[8]

The document opens with the declaration: 'There are two ways: one is the Way of Life, the other is the Way of Death; and there is a mighty difference between these two ways.'[9] It is widely accepted that the first redactional layer of the *Didache* (reflected in chapters 1-6) is an ancient

[4] Cf. Voobus (1969).

[5] Cf. Draper (1996c), 91.

[6] Cf. Flusser (1996).

[7] Cf. Milavec (2003b), 695-739.

[8] Cf. Draper (1996a), 243.

[9] *Did.* 1.1 [O'Loughlin (2010), 161].

Jewish tradition known as the Two Ways.[10] In the centuries preceding the turn of the era, Jews were having significant success in the proselytization of Gentiles throughout the Mediterranean. The teaching on the Two Ways was an adaptation of the Hebrew Scriptures,[11] formulated to teach Gentile 'God-fearers' the basic requisites of ethical monotheism. This tradition served as the foundation of the *Didache*, upon which the framers added other traditional Jewish material, Christian oral tradition, Jewish prayers, and some original material.[12]

There are various elements within the *Didache* that mark it as a unique expression of early Jewish-Christianity. It demonstrates little affinity with Paul's doctrine of the Law and grace, and there is no awareness of the accommodations of the Jerusalem council of Acts 15. Its communities still held the aspiration that the Law could be kept and they made the righteousness defined by the Law their goal. The authors and framers were Jewish followers of Jesus, who embraced him as the servant (τοῦ παιδός) of God through whom the true path to this righteousness had been revealed.[13] Even though they had separated themselves from the synagogue,[14] they still practiced many of the conventions of first-century Judaism. What we find in the *Didache* are numerous adaptations of Jewish traditions which, as I have mentioned, were made for the purpose of training Gentile converts.[15]

[10] For a survey of the history of the Two Ways tradition, see Sandt and Flusser (2002), 55-80.

[11] Sandt and Flusser (2002), 58, cite the '*topos*' of the Two Ways as being reflected in the following passages: Dt 11:26-28; 30:15-19; Jer 21:8; Ps 1:6; 119:29-30; 139:24; Pr 2:13; 4:18-19; 11:20.

[12] It is generally accepted that the *Didache* reached something very close to its current form no later than the end of the first century [cf. O'Loughlin (2003), 86]. It is important to note that the composite character of the *Didache* in no way diminishes the overall coherence of its message Sandt and Flusser (2002), 31, have noted that, 'The Didache must not be treated ... as a fragmented collage of materials only, for since as a whole it is a community rule, intended to regulate the behavior of the community, the manual deserves to be considered as a coherent systematic unity as well.'

[13] *Did.* 9.3: 'We give thanks to you, our Father, for the life and knowledge which you have made know to us. Through Jesus, your servant, to you be glory forever.' [O'Loughlin (2010), 167]

[14] *Did.* 8.1-2 state that the customs of fasting and prayer should not be carried out in the same fashion as 'the hypocrites.'

[15] This dynamic is clearly seen in the Eucharistic prayer of chapters 9-10. Despite their semblance to Jewish prayers (i.e. the *Birkat Ha Mazon*), Schwiebert (2008), 120, argues that these prayers are original compositions of the *Didache* communities, intended to give the appearance of conventionality. He notes: 'It is best, therefore, to conclude that the conventions of the *Didache*'s meal ritual represent a new fusion of older

The primary concern of the *Didache* is discipleship. It is a manual designed to guide the formation of a spiritual body that will be fully submitted to the teachings of Jesus. In spite of their idealistic clinging to the Law, practical reality drove the leaders of the *Didache* communities toward a certain degree of pragmatism. Turning a group of egregiously sinful pagans into a righteous, ordered community was not an overnight process. To be sure, there were many Jewish members of the communities who had been raised to live in strict adherence to the Mosaic Law. But many of these disciples — if not most — had not grown up under the tutelage of Moses, but in the world of first-century pagan culture. Sacrifices to idols, astrology, curses, spells, magic potions, and orgies had all been the ingredients of their spiritual formation. These were people who were emerging from chaotic lifestyles, and for whom a strict adherence to the Law would have been extremely difficult. Thus, the leaders of the *Didache* communities had to find a discipleship approach in which they could be true to their Jewish roots, while still accommodating Gentile converts. The way that they managed this tension was to offer a compromise:

> Now if you are able to bear the whole of the Lord's yoke, you will be complete. However, if you are not able [to bear that yoke], then do what you can. And concerning food regulations, bear what you are able. However, you must keep strictly away from meat that has been sacrificed to idols, for involvement with it involves worship of dead gods.[16]

There was an impetus toward order, which proceeded from the notion that completeness was to be found in adherence to the Law. They were unwilling to abandon the Torah as the ideal. Nonetheless, they could tolerate a bit of chaos. The instruction was simply this: *Try to keep the Law, but if you find it too difficult, then just do your best.*

The application of this instruction surely resulted in a high degree of disorder: Some eating pork, others abstaining; some circumcising their children, others choosing not to do so; some strictly observing the Sabbath, others taking a more 'laid back' approach; some eating blood, and

ritual building blocks with the entirely new, fixed element '[which you made known] through Jesus your servant.' This crucial structural element ... represents the response of a community, in a ritual context, to the figure of Jesus and what he makes known ... Thus, the Didache's ritual, despite its tantalizing Jewish roots, ultimately takes its characteristic posture from its own new fusion of the old and the new, becoming in the process a ritual for a certain type of (Jewish) community.'

16 *Did.* 6.2-3 [O'Loughlin (2010), 165].

others refraining. Many people in their midst created their own eclectic admixture of the laws that they would keep or ignore. Each person was free to make these decisions for herself. The only specific prohibition was against meat sacrificed to idols. Thus, there was a potential for total disorder. Yet, the underlying assumption of the *Didache* is that as they prayed and continued in the community discipline, the Father would lead them toward order and perfection.[17] Thus, a bit of chaos was tolerated, because it was only of a temporal nature.

This approach of 'flexibility within boundaries' not only characterizes the *Didache*'s position on the Law, but many other aspects of their ritual and community life. It applied to their practices of baptism, communal prayer and hospitality, as seen in the following passages:

- In the instructional section on baptism (*Did.* 7.1-4),[18] we find both elements of order and chaos. As a rite of initiation, baptism in water utilizing the Trinitarian formula is a strict requirement. However, the *Didache* allows for great flexibility in other aspects: there is no set place, no set type of water, no set person to baptize, flexibility with regard to immersion or sprinkling, and a bit of ambiguity with regard to who would fast.
- *Didache* 9-10 lays out liturgical, orderly prayers which were to be said in the worship service. But an allowance is made for a certain degree of spontaneity as well. After these formal prayers are concluded, the communities are instructed to, 'permit the prophets to give thanks in whatever manner they wish.'[19] This accommodation was made, no doubt, because the prophets needed to pray 'as the Spirit led.' They didn't want to be limited by a pre-formatted prayer, they wanted to pray from the heart.
- *Didache* 11-13 sets forth guidelines for the practice of hospitality. Every apostle, prophet or teacher who wants to stay among them has to be received.[20] Yet, limitations are set in place. The duration of the apostle's visit is to be limited,[21] and when leaving he can't

[17] This hope is expressed, for example, in *Did.* 10.5: 'Remember, Lord, your church, deliver her from evil, make her complete in your love.' [O'Loughlin (2010), 167]

[18] *Did.* 7.1-4.

[19] *Did.* 10.7, [O'Loughlin (2010), 168].

[20] See *Did.* 11.4; 13.1-2.

[21] *Did.* 11.5.

> ask for excessive provisions.[22] While a guest, a prophet cannot use his prophetic gift as a means of getting special meals or other benefits for himself.[23] The text offers clear guidelines for proving the validity of a prophet or apostle.[24] If they are found to be selfish or manipulative they are to be rejected.[25]

In each of these instances we find an ethos that is at once idealistic and pragmatic. The communities envisioned a coming time of perfect harmony.[26] Yet they accepted the reality that such perfection was not possible in the present state of affairs. As long as new converts from paganism kept coming in, as long as rivers ran dry, as long as prophets would insist on 'doing their own thing,' and as long as guests would overstay their welcome — these Christians would have to accept the reality of an imperfect world. What gave the communities a sense of order in the midst of this chaos was their hope in the transformative work of the Spirit. The diverse members of the communities did not have to reach perfection all at once. The basis of unity was not in uniformity. Their unity was found in their common *desire* for completeness, and their common *faith* that in Christ it would be attained. As long as they agreed upon this vision, a degree of disarray was tolerable.[27] This navigation of order and chaos was central to the genius of the *Didache*'s discipleship methodology. The communities understood that the Way of Life showed the path toward

[22] *Did.* 11.6.

[23] *Did.* 11.9, 12.

[24] *Did.* 11.8.

[25] *Did.* 12.5.

[26] *Did.* 9.4; 10.5.

[27] Sociologist Peter Berger (1967), 23-24, notes that this ordering function lies at the very heart of religious experience: 'The marginal situations of human existence reveal the innate precariousness of all social worlds. Every socially defined reality remains threatened by lurking "irrealities." Every socially constructed *nomos* must face the constant possibility of its collapse into anomy. Seen in the perspective of society, every *nomos* is an area of meaning carved out of a vast mass of meaninglessness, a small clearing of lucidity in a formless, dark, always ominous jungle. Seen in the perspective of the individual, every *nomos* represents the bright "dayside" of life, tenuously held onto against the sinister shadows of the "night." In both perspectives, every *nomos* is an edifice erected in the face of the potent and alien forces of chaos. This chaos must be kept at bay at all cost. To ensure this, every society develops procedures that assist its members to remain "reality-oriented" (that is, to remain within the reality as "officially" defined) and to "return to reality" (that is, to return from the marginal spheres of "irreallity" to the socially established *nomos*).'

perfection — even as they would need to walk that road in patience, hope and forgiveness.

B. *The Ordering Effect of Prayer*

The LP played a significant role in application of this community ethos. Berger has noted that religious communities often rely on certain processes by means of which, 'their continuing reality, both objective (as common, taken-for-granted facticity) and subjective (as facticity imposing itself on individual consciousness),' is reconstructed and maintained.[28] The recitation of the LP was one of these mechanisms by which the fellowship maintained a sense of order within the confusion of their everyday lives. In a social world dominated by *idolaters* and *hypocrites*, they needed a daily reinforcement of their identity, their worldview, and their ethos. The daily recitation of the LP served this function. In the morning, afternoon and evening it required them to refocus on the *nomos* to which they aspired. Wherever they found themselves, the recitation of the LP brought them into harmony with their community.[29] They remembered that they were not alone; they were part of a family who shared their needs, struggles, and vision. Within the vicissitudes of life was to be found much chaos. But the discipline of the thrice daily recitation of the LP brought order.

III. The Interpretation of the Lord's Prayer among the *Didache* Communities

A. *Introduction*

To summarize what we have established thus far: we have noted that a fundamental characteristic of the *Didache*'s ethos is a *spirituality of the road.* The communities saw themselves as being on the way to perfection. They had committed themselves to walk on the path of life, ac-

[28] Berger (1967), 45.

[29] O'Loughlin (2003), 102, comments that although the church did not physically gather three times per day, this shared moment of prayer nonetheless constituted an assembly: 'they viewed this thrice daily prayer as an act of collective worship, the prayer of the whole Christian community, rather than as instructions to Christian on how to organize a personal prayer regime ... three times a day, the whole church assembled and made an act of prayer using a single formula and unified through a common moment of time.'

knowledging that on the journey itself, there would be chaos, disorder, and periodic stumbling. For this reason, the framers of the *Didache* created mechanisms and processes to help the community cope with this unpleasant reality. The community rule allowed for a certain degree of chaos with regard to matters such as the application of the Law, public worship, hospitality, and baptism. But boundaries were set in place that would keep the disorder to a tolerable limit. The *Didache*'s program of discipleship was characterized by grace, patience and pragmatism. Yet, this in no way signified a compromise in the ideals of the community. The *Didache* held out a clear hope for the future restoration and purification the church.

The regular recitation of the LP was an important element in the maintenance of this ethos, and the worldview that it sustained.[30] The daily discipline of prayer served as an ordering function in the lives of the community members. It brought them into solidarity with one another, as it reinforced their beliefs and their values.

Beyond the ritualistic function of this prayer, its message was rich in theological content and spiritual vision. Amidst chaos and disorder, it was a prayer crying out for the sanctification of the community. It was the means by which the fellowship would set its hope upon the coming restoration. They would reaffirm their commitment to righteousness, their willingness to share, their need to forgive and receive forgiveness, and their desire to overcome the evil and sin in their own lives.

Using the seven petitions of the LP[31] as points of reference, we will now seek to uncover the world that the *Didache* constructed, and the system of values that it advocated in light of this reality.

[30] Geertz (1968), 97 notes that the role of religious symbols (such as prayer) is to 'formulate an image of the world's construction and a program for human conduct.' He continues: 'Such symbols render the world view believable and the ethos justifiable, and they do so by invoking each in the support of the other. The world view is believable because the ethos, which grows out of it, is felt to be authoritative; the ethos is justifiable because the worldview, upon which it rests, is held to be true.'

[31] The entire text of the LP in the *Didache* is found in *Did.* 8.2: 'Πάτερ ἡμῶν ὁ ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ ἁγιασθήτω τὸ ὄνομά σου, ἐλθέτω ἡ βασιλεία σου, γενηθήτω τὸ θέλημά σου ὡς ἐν οὐρανῷ καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς· τὸν ἄρτον ἡμῶν τὸν ἐπιούσιον δὸς ἡμῖν σήμερον, καὶ ἄφες ἡμῖν τὴν ὀφειλὴν ἡμῶν, ὡς καὶ ἡμεῖς ἀφίεμεν τοῖς ὀφειλέταις ἡμῶν, καὶ μὴ εἰσενέγκῃς ἡμᾶς εἰς πειρασμόν, ἀλλὰ ῥῦσαι ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ τοῦ πονηροῦ· ὅτι σοῦ ἐστιν ἡ δύναμις καὶ ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας.' The text is very similar to that of Matthew, with the differences being: 1) τῷ οὐρανῷ/ τοῖς οὐρανοῖς; 2) τὴν ὀφειλὴν ἡμῶν/ τὰ ὀφειλήματα ἡμῶν; 3) ἀφίεμεν/ ἀφήκαμεν; 4) the doxology: ὅτι σοῦ ἐστιν ἡ δύναμις καὶ ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας. For a discussion on the significance of these variations, see Milavec (2003b), 312-313.

B. The Name of God

Addressing Him as 'our Father in heaven,' the *Didache* communities prayed for the sanctification of God's name.[32] In order to determine what this first petition meant to them, we look to the internal context of the *Didache* to see how the *name of God* was understood. The overarching significance of this motif throughout the text is the intertwining of identity between the Father and His people:[33] at baptism, God's name is bestowed upon the individuals who join the community;[34] participation in the Eucharist is prohibited to those who have not received the name;[35] anyone who bears the name is to be welcomed as a brother or sister;[36] and the name dwelt in the hearts of the people.[37] In all these examples, we see that the Father has shared His identity with His people.

It thus follows that, the sanctification of His name on earth is intertwined with the sanctity of His followers. God had created all things for the purpose of His name,[38] and the communities looked forward to the time when His name would be a cause of wonder among all the nations.[39] But this vision for the honoring of God's name among the nations could only become reality if the *ecclesia* itself became a cause of

[32] ἁγιασθήτω τὸ ὄνομά σου (*Did*. 8.2).

[33] Draper (2000), 145, comments: 'At the sensory pole, a name is a vocalization which identifies a person within a particular family and kinship structure. It is conferred by parents and/or kin, and thus symbolizes belonging within a primary socialization process. By extension it is also identified with power: initially the power of the parent over the child, but subsequently the power of the universe represented by its God over each member of the society.'

[34] 'Baptize in the name of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit.' (*Did*. 7.1), [O'Loughlin (2010), 164] Draper (2000), 146, notes: 'The solemn utterance of the Name of God over the candidate in baptism (7:1, 3; 9:5) symbolizes at its ideological pole, the conferring of a new identity and a new kin at the conclusion of the process of resocialization.'

[35] 'Only let those who have been baptized in the name of the Lord eat and drink at your Eucharists.' (*Did*. 9.5), [O'Loughlin (2010), 167]

[36] 'Now anyone coming the in the Lord's name should be made welcome.' (*Did*. 12.1), [O'Loughlin (2010), 169]

[37] 'We give you thanks, holy Father, for your holy name which you have made to dwell in our hearts.' (*Did*. 10.2), [O'Loughlin (2010), 167]

[38] 'You are the mighty ruler of all who has created all for your name's sake.' (*Did*. 10.3), [O'Loughlin (2010), 167] The Greek reads: σύ, δέσποτα παντοκράτορ, ἔκτισας τὰ πάντα ἕνεκεν τοῦ ὀνόματός σου.

[39] *Did*. 14.3 cites Mal 1:11, in declaring that God's name is to be 'feared among the nations.' [O'Loughlin (2010), 170]

wonder, and an object of honor.[40] Apart from their sanctification, the name of God could not be sanctified on earth. Thus, it was imperative that the community move toward perfection.

The sanctity of the *ecclesia* was symbolized by the Jerusalem sanctuary. *Community as Temple* was a theme that found expression in their self-identity.[41] Just as the Father had set his name over the Temple, He now caused His holy name to dwell in their hearts.[42] Their prayers and Eucharistic celebrations were the Temple sacrifices,[43] and they had to

[40] A glimpse of *universality* and *particularity* is seen in *Did.* 10.3: 'You are the mighty ruler of all who has created all for your name's sake, and you have given food and drink to human beings for their enjoyment so that they might give thanks to you. But to us, from your generosity, you have given spiritual food and drink, and life eternal, through your servant.' [O'Loughlin (2010), 167] The declaration to God is that He has created all things for the sake of His name (ἔκτισας τὰ πάντα ἕνεκεν τοῦ ὀνόματός σου). He has provided food for all humanity, with the intention that they would honor Him. To His church He has given His special gift of 'spiritual food and drink' through Jesus. This gift too, comes for sake of His name, and the hope is that, by the revelation of Jesus through the church, all humanity may give thanks to the Father.

[41] Reed (1996), 222, notes: 'In some ways the *Didache* conceives of the church as the new temple. The community's gatherings are sacrifices, their officials are priests. And those who come to them from outside are considered as pilgrims who travel to the temple ... In this regard *Didache* 11-15 as a whole reveals something of the spatial imagination of the community of the *Didache*. Rather than operate under the view that divinity is centered in Jerusalem or the temple, the Didachist imagines that the spiritual center of the universe lies within the community of the *Didache*.' See also Milavec (2003b), 786.

[42] See *Did.* 10. 2. Draper (2000), 146, notes that 'just as the Name of God was understood to tabernacle within his temple in Jerusalem, displayed for instance in 1 Kings 8:27-30, the new community is holy/separate and enjoys the continued presence of the Name of God in its midst, like the temple.'

[43] See *Did.* 14.2-3. Milavec (2003d), 71, and Niederwimmer (1998), 197, posit that the *Didache* is the oldest reference to the Eucharist as sacrifice. Milavec comments: 'the act of gathering together, taking a meal, and giving thanks (all named in Didache 14: 1) was the true "sacrifice" pleasing to God. This meant that the festive Eucharistic meal celebrating the election of Israel and anticipating the final ingathering constituted the "sacrifice" of the community.' I concur with this opinion, adding that all forms of prayer, including the daily recitation of the LP, would be incorporated into what the community considered to be 'sacrifice.' Milavec (2003d), 74, argues that the Eucharist was characterized by the sacrality of sacrifice, and therefore a prior purification of the participants was needed: 'confession of failings was positively necessary to offer a "pure sacrifice."' Whereas *Did.* 4.1-3 set this confession within the context of the Eucharist, *Did.* 4.14 suggests that a time of confession was necessary prior to the participation in *any* communal prayer: 'In church you shall confess your transgressions, and you shall not approach your prayer with an evil conscience.' [O'Loughlin (2010), 170] Thus, the sacrality of sacrifice was ascribed to prayer in general, and not exclusively to the Eucharistic celebration.

A further question can be here raised as to whether the recitation of the LP constituted part of the Eucharistic celebrations. Milavec (2003b), 335, argues against

guard against anything that would defile their offerings.[44] Consequently, even as the fellowship recognized that sanctification was a process, they also viewed themselves as a people upon whom the Father had bestowed His own holiness.

Thus, on the lips of these Christians, the prayer of ἁγιασθήτω τὸ ὄνομά σου would have been a cry for the ongoing purification of the community itself. They knew that they had already been given relationship with the one whom they addressed as Father. They believed that their right-standing with God was fundamentally because of His grace. Yet they understood that the eschatological sanctification of His name on earth was dependent upon their own progress along the Way of Life. He had shared with them His very identity. His honor on the earth was tied up with their community life. They implored Him for assistance in living in such a way that would result in the sanctification of His name among the nations.

C. *The Coming Kingdom*

In the second petition of the LP, the *Didache* communities prayed for the coming of the Father's kingdom.[45] As we have noted in chapter 2, for first-century Jews the kingdom of God signified the restoration of Israel. According to Wright this phrase would denote 'the action of the covenant god, within Israel's history, to restore her fortunes, to bring to an end the bitter period of exile, and to defeat through her, the evil that ruled the whole world.'[46] For the fellowships of the *Didache*, the literal restoration of the twelve tribes to the land of Israel, and the defeat of her political enemies, no longer figured in their concept of the kingdom. They had parted ways with the predominant Pharisaic Judaism of their day, and their community had embraced a large number of Gentiles. This is not to say, however, that they abandoned the traditional imagery associated with this theme.

This *ecclesia* saw itself as the heir of God's promises to Israel. They had been made part of the 'holy vine of David' through Jesus, the serv-

this notion, saying, 'at no point is there any hint that the Lord's Prayer was recited as part of the eucharist.' However, this matter ultimately depends on how tightly they would have defined the Eucharist. When the communities gathered on the Lord's day, they undoubtedly prayed the LP. They also celebrated a Eucharistic meal. How they may have demarcated the various stages of their gatherings is a matter of conjecture.

[44] See *Did.* 4.14; 9.5; 14.2.

[45] ἐλθέτω ἡ βασιλεία σου (*Did.* 8.2).

[46] Wright (1992), 307.

ant of the Father.[47] Having been grafted into this vine, the promise of the coming Davidic kingdom was now theirs. In the Eucharistic prayers they prayed: 'Just as this broken bread was scattered on the mountains and then was gathered together and became one, so may your church be gathered together from the ends of the earth into your kingdom;'[48] and, 'Remember your church, Lord, to deliver it from all evil and to make it perfect in your love; and from the four winds gather the church that has been sanctified (τὴν ἁγιασθεῖσαν) into your kingdom, which you have prepared for it.'[49] The communities of the *Didache* viewed themselves as the heirs of the kingdom which God had promised to the Israel-of-old.[50]

Particularly for the Gentile members, a literal understanding of *gathering the church from the four winds* would have seemed strange. This was the symbolic language of the kingdom. The exile of the twelve tribes described the present struggle of the *ecclesia*. She was 'scattered on the mountains' in disarray, beset by the forces of evil and in need of purification. The hope of the kingdom was the hope of being brought to wholeness, and being made perfect in the Father's love.

There was an eschatological facet of this hope, but a present expectation as well. Even as the completion of their sanctification was a future event, 'knowledge and faith and immortality' had already been made known to them through Jesus.[51] They were experiencing the power and the glory of the kingdom at the present time. Thus, in this second petition of the LP, we hear again the heart cry of the *ecclesia* to be purified, to be re-gathered from the chaos of exile and brought into the perfect

47 *Did*. 9.1.

48 *Did*. 9.4, [Holmes (2007), 359].

49 *Did*. 10.5, [Holmes (2007), 361].

50 Reed (1996), 220, notes: 'Through the usage of this terminology, the Didachist's community proclaims itself to be the remnant of Israel, to be grafted as the inheritors of the Davidic kingdom. The language of "scattering" and "gathering" (διασκορπίζω and συνάγω, 9.4) reinforces the Didachist's belief that the community of the *Didache* is the remnant of Israel. The term is διασκορπίζω usually used in the Septuagint to describe what God does to all enemies. The prophet Ezekiel (Ez 5:2, 10), however, uses the term to describe the diaspora of the inhabitants of Jerusalem, while Zech 13:7-9 uses the term to describe the exile as a scattering of sheep. The Eucharistic prayer of the *Didache* proclaims, in essence, that what once was scattered as Israel will be gathered together from the comers of the earth as the church. And the spatial focus, or the center of the universe, is the community itself — not Zion, not Jerusalem, not Israel as a place. References to Hebrew Scriptures which focus upon the land, or Jerusalem as a holy city, or the temple as a place for worship are absent in the *Didache*.

51 *Did*. 10.2, [O'Loughlin (2010), 167].

order that the kingdom symbolized. It was a work that would be consummated at a future time, but which had already begun in their midst.

D. *The Will of the Father*

In the third petition of the LP, the people prayed, 'your will be done.'[52] Among first-century Jews and early Christian communities, the exact understanding of 'the will of God' could vary. Among those who utilized the tradition of the Two Ways, this concept found different expressions. On the one hand, some of these communities would have perceived of God's will as the simple unfolding of the divine blueprint by which He pre-determined all of human history.[53] In this line of thought, the Way of Death and the Way of Life are equally reflected as the exercise of the sovereign will. On the other hand, there were Christians and Jews who believed that the fulfillment of God's will was, in many respects, a matter of human choice. They would argue that people have the freedom to choose between sin and righteousness.[54] God wills that all humanity would choose the Way of Life, and He wills that no one would choose the Way of Death.

There are patterns in the textual development of the *Didache* which indicate that its adherents belonged to the latter group. As we analyze the redactive and editorial activity of this document's framers, we discover a deliberate disassociation from notions of pre-determinism, and a strong inclination toward the human freedom to choose between the Way of Life and the Way of Death.

As we have noted above, the tradition of the Two Ways had a long history, both prior and subsequent to the writing of the *Didache*. Many of the Jewish communities who utilized this tradition held to a predeterministic belief system. The Qumran community was the most notable of these groups. A version of the Two Ways underlies 1 QS

[52] γενηθήτω τὸ θέλημά σου (*Did*. 8.2).

[53] Sandt and Flusser (2002), 151, note, 'Dualistic beliefs in terms of predetermination are found in various Jewish writings which, although not sectarian in character, probably belonged to the wider Essene movement such as Jub 10:1, 9, 11; 15:31b-32a; Sir 42:24-25; T. Asher 1:8-9; 3:3; 6:2, and 6:4-6.'

[54] Rordorf (1996), 153, comments on the co-existence of these variant systems of doctrine: 'I see the evolution rather in the following manner: the Old Testament ethical tradition attached to the *Bundesformular* has undergone in certain circles of late Judaism (not in all) a clearly dualistic modification under Persian influence ... Christianity has inherited both these currents, dualistic and non-dualistic. In the New Testament, we find both these traditions. Is it not possible that the different forms of the Christian *duae viae* also reflect the two traditions?'

3:13-14:26,[55] wherein one section reads: 'And in the hand of the Prince of Lights is dominion over all the sons of justice; they walk on paths of light. And in the hand of the Angel of Darkness is total dominion over the sons of deceit; they walk on paths of darkness.'[56] According to Sandt and Flusser, the concept of the two spirits

> is closely connected with this notion of predetermination ... the Prince of Lights is synonymous with the Spirit of Truth and the Angel of Darkness is equivalent to the Spirit of Deceit. The function of the two spirits is to control all people for good and evil and men are assigned to one or the other spirit as a result of the will of God.[57]

Sandt and Flusser have formulated a 'family tree' of the Two Ways tradition, illustrating how different communities adapted and edited this teaching according to their needs and doctrinal inclinations.[58] They have reconstructed a Greek version of the Two Ways, which they suggest was utilized by many early Christian documents, including the *Didache*. The opening lines of their text read:

> There are two ways in the world, one of life, the other of death, one of light, the other of darkness; upon them two angels are appointed, one of righteousness, the other of iniquity, and between the two ways there is a great difference.[59]

Notable in this version are the two angels who preside over the paths of life and death, suggesting that these spirits control the activities of men.

Although this Greek text was the source tradition for *Didache* 1.1, the destiny-controlling angels are conspicuously absent: 'There are two ways, one of life and one of death, and there is a great difference between these two ways.'[60] This editing activity indicates a deliberate movement away from any from pre-deterministic thought. Kloppenburg concludes: 'The editor of the Two Ways in the *Didache* has significantly reduced the

[55] Cf. Audet (1996).

[56] 1 QS 3:20-21, [García Martínez & Tigchelaar (1997-1998), 75].

[57] Sandt and Flusser (2002), 150.

[58] See Sandt and Flusser (2002), 55-139. Notable early Christian documents which share the Two Ways tradition are the Epistle of Barnabas and the *Doctrina Apostolorum*.

[59] Sandt and Flusser (2002), 128.

[60] *Did.* 1.1, [Holmes (2007), 345].

cosmic dualism of the earlier Two Ways tradition.'[61] What this person (or persons) wished to emphasize was that the Two Ways represent the life-and-death decisions that men and women must make. The path that any individual walks upon is a matter of her free-will choice. Within the *Didache*, O'Loughlin notes, 'there is no place ... for cosmic fatalism such as the notion that our destiny is written in the stars. In this vision our destiny is in our own hands: we must positively choose good and deliberately avoid evil.'[62]

The *Didache* thus presents *the doing of God's will* as contingent upon human choices. Men and women are not under the power of an angel of light who controls their right conduct, nor are others under the power of a dark angel who compels them to do evil. The doing of God's will is a choice. It is fulfilled when people choose to walk upon the path of life.

When the Christians of the *Didache* prayed, 'Let your will be done,' they were praying for themselves, and for all humanity. To walk on the path of life was a matter of their own election. Yet, they acknowledged in this petition their need for God's assistance in righteous living. They understood that the choice to walk on the path of life would at times be difficult. As Christians, they would be cursed, persecuted and hated;[63] they would be abused and exploited;[64] a time of testing was coming wherein there would be apostasy, betrayal, and increased persecution.[65] In the midst of life's difficulties, this was a prayer for God to turn their hearts, and the hearts of all people toward Him in repentance and obedience.

Another dimension of this petition is the idea of surrendering to the wisdom of God. In asking for His will to be done, the people submitted their own preferences and choices to Him, acknowledging that His ways were better than their own. It is in this light that *Did.* 3.10 states: 'Accept as good the things that happen to you, knowing that nothing transpires apart from God.'[66] The church was called to walk in an attitude of humble submission before the wisdom of God. Rather than questioning or complaining about the things that transpired in their

[61] Kloppenberg (1995), 97. See also Suggs (1972), 72, and Sandt and Flusser (2002), 141-152.

[62] O'Loughlin (2010), 30.

[63] *Did.* 1.3.

[64] *Did.* 1.4.

[65] *Did.* 16.

[66] τὰ συμβαίνοντά σοι ἐνεργήματα ὡς ἀγαθὰ προσδέξῃ, εἰδὼς ὅτι ἄτερ θεοῦ οὐδὲν γίνεται. Forms of this aphorism appear in Stoic, biblical, Jewish and Christian texts.

lives, the *Didache* urged its disciples to accept that God's will and God's purposes were good.[67]

In sum, the petition 'let your will be done,' was a way of saying, 'help us, and all humanity, to choose the path of life.' It reinforced their personal commitment to righteousness, even as they acknowledged their need for God's assistance. It was also an act of surrender, a way of releasing their choices, preferences and understanding to the will of the Father. Amidst the chaos of daily life, the *good way — the right way —* was not always easy to follow, nor always easy to discern. The communities of the *Didache* believed that the ultimate responsibility for their choices was theirs, but they sought to exercise their freedom in a spirit of dependence and submission to their heavenly Father.

E. On Earth as it is in Heaven

The *Didache* fellowships held to the hope that when Jesus returned, the earth would be transformed. As part of their Eucharistic prayers, they would customarily cry, 'Hosanna' and 'Maranatha;' 'May grace come and may this world pass away.'[68] At his coming, they believed that their unity would be perfected, their sanctification made complete, and the kingdom of God would be firmly established on the earth.[69] The world was a hostile place.[70] They longed for the day when they would be free from the lure of sin, when temptation and evil would no longer beset

[67] Niederwimmer (1998), 102, notes that for some of the ancients, this aphorism had a more deterministic sense. He cites the following examples: Cleanthes Hymn to Zeus, 'no work on earth takes place without you, O deity,' (SVF 1.122.11);' It is best to suffer what you cannot change, and commit; yourself to god, who is the author of all things, without complaint,' (Seneca *Epistulae Morales* 107.9); 'All that is, he governs according to his plan, and without him nothing occurs,' (IQS 11.11).

On the other hand, he also cites examples wherein this axiom speaks to the importance of a proper attitude: 'all things work together for good for those who love God, who are called according to his purpose,' (Rom 8:28); 'the divine Scripture teaches us to accept all things that happen to us as if they were brought about by God,' (Origen *De Principiis* 3.2.7); 'it is necessary to believe that none of the things that happen takes place without God; and that all that comes from him is good, even if it be painful,' (Dionysius of Alexandria in John of Damascus *Sacra parallela* 33).

[68] *Did.* 10.6, [O'Loughlin (2010), 168]. The Greek reads: ἐλθέτω χάρις καὶ παρελθέτω ὁ κόσμος οὗτος.

[69] See *Did.* 10.5.

[70] The authors of the *Didache* were at pains to 'spell out' sin. Among the transgressions listed in chapters 2-3 are the following: murder, adultery, pedophilia, promiscuity, theft, divination, magic, abortion, infanticide, perjury, lying, speaking evil, holding grudges, fickleness, deceit, avarice, greed, hypocrisy, spite, disdain, evil plotting, hatred, anger, being argumentative, jealousy, lust, fornication, obscene speech,

them, and when they could enjoy the grace and the freedom that Jesus would bestow upon them.

The same eschatological vision that is expressed in the cry 'May grace come and may this world pass away' is articulated again in the LP as, 'on earth as it is in heaven.'[71] We have noted in chapter 3, that rather than serving as an appendage to the third petition, this phrase is better understood as a bridge between the first and second sections of the LP. The first section of the prayer speaks of the glory of heaven, the second describes the chaos of life on earth. In the first section, petitions are made on the basis of the glory of God: His holiness, His kingdom, and His will. In the second, petitions are made on the basis of human need: for food, forgiveness, and strength in the battle against temptation and evil.

The tension between order and chaos that was part of the church's daily experience was now articulated in prayer. In the LP, their ideals of righteousness and harmony were now set against the practical reality of material need, sin and disorder. As they prayed 'On earth as it is in heaven,' the overarching hope expressed in these words was that heaven would come to earth, that order would overcome chaos, and that life would triumph over death. But in that moment between *the now and not yet*, they had to fight the battle. Theirs was a *spirituality of the road*. Sanctification worked itself out in the 'little things' of daily life. It would happen as they made right choices.

F. Daily Bread

The communities prayed, 'give us today our daily bread.'[72] Two things stand out with regard to the attitude that they held toward God's provision of bread. First, they believed that God's material provision made it incumbent upon them to share with another. Second, they viewed the Father's material provision as an extension of the spiritual gifts that He had given to them. These two facets of the daily bread are reflected in the following verses:

> You shall not turn away from someone in need, but shall share everythingwith 'our brother or sister, and do not claim that anything is your

a roaming eye, astrology, vanity, grumbling, blasphemy, arrogance, bad-mindedness, haughtiness. See also 5.2 for a continued description of sin.

[71] ὡς ἐν οὐρανῷ καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς (*Did*. 8.2).

[72] τὸν ἄρτον ἡμῶν τὸ ἐπιούσιον δὸς ἡμῖν σήμερον (*Did*. 8.2).

> own. For if you are sharers in what is imperishable, how much more so in perishable things! (*Did.* 4:8)
>
> You, almighty Master, created all things for your name's sake, and gave food and drink to humans to enjoy, so that they might give you thanks but to us you have graciously given spiritual food and drink, and eternal life through your servant. (*Did.* 10:3)[73]

'Give us this day our daily bread' was a petition for material provision. In light of the fact that they viewed God's provision of food and drink as a manifestation of His goodness to all mankind, there was, no doubt, a confidence that this petition would be granted. But they also understood their own role in bringing the fulfillment of this petition to pass. They believed that God's provision for the poor would often come through His people on earth. Thus, the text commands: 'Give to everyone who asks you, and do not demand it back, for the Father wants something from his own gifts to be given to everyone.'[74]

A significant portion of the *Didache* is devoted to the topic of sharing material goods. *Did.* 1:5-6 and 4:5-8 set forth principles for dealing with the materially disadvantaged; and chapters 11-13 provide guidelines for visitors in need of assistance. Although these guidelines do not ignore the possibility for abuse, the fundamental expectation is that the members of the community will provide for anyone and everyone who has a material need.[75]

This responsibility to share was rooted the spiritual blessing that they had received. In both passages above, the movement between the physical and spiritual is very fluid. Spiritual food does not replace the

[73] Finkelstein (1929), 214, considered the Eucharsitic prayers of chapters 9 and 10 to be Christian modifications of the *Birkat Ha-Mazon*, with an anti-semitic slant. (He viewed *Did.* 10.3, 'but to us ... you have given spiritual food,' as a 'slur upon the Jews.') Finkelstein's wrote his article, however, before the discovery of the Dura Europos fragments. These third-century documents suggest that the spiritualization of food was not a Christian innovation, nor a slur against Jews, but rather a motif common to Jewish meal prayers, as one such prayer reads: 'Blessed be the Lord, King of the Universe, who created all things, apportioned food, appointed drink for all the children of flesh with which they shall be satisfied. But granted to us, human beings, to partake of the food of the myriads of his angelic bodies.' [Teicher (1963), 104]

[74] *Did.* 1.5.

[75] Niederwimmer (1998), 82, remarks: 'This is a very Jewish idea: God's creative gifts are given for all therefore poor people have a right to alms, and the wealthy are obligated in turn to give them. Moreover, it should be noted that the gifts given by the rich to the poor are really God's gifts. Thus the one who gives alms is only a manager, one who distributes the divine gifts.'

material. The argument is that if the communities have together shared the bread of heaven, how much more they must share with another their material bread.[76] Thus, the petition, 'Give us today our daily bread,' would have been an explicit petition to God and an implicit commitment to one another. They looked to Him to meet their material needs, even as they looked at one another to help and to share as the circumstances required. The impetus to share with one another flowed from the 'spiritual food and drink and eternal life' that they had received through Jesus. They had been made partakers (κοινωνοί) of the imperishable. A failure to share their material goods would represent a failure to honor the value of the spiritual riches that they had all received.

G. *Forgiveness*

The fellowships prayed, 'Forgive us our debt as we forgive our debtors.'[77] We have mentioned above that the *Didache* communities viewed the confession of their sins as a pre-requisite for participation in communal prayer and the Eucharist. In order to offer a 'pure sacrifice,' a prior cleansing was necessary. Confession and forgiveness, however, played a much larger role in community life. These acts were essential to sanctification. Milavec comments:

> The mention of specific failings by any individual reminded the entire community that such things were to be avoided. Thus, the scope of the Way of Life was renewed-and maybe even expanded-in the minds of all present. The mention of specific failings by each member also provided the occasion wherein persons close to them came to a deepened awareness of how these persons needed support in particular ways. Finally, while humiliation or self abasement was not the primary goal of the confession, one can easily understand how a person locked in a particular sin would, after repeatedly confessing the same failing, either reform his/her life or leave the community.[78]

[76] The question has been raised as to whether the *Didache* communities would have equated the daily bread (τὸν ἄρτον τὸ ἐπιούσιον) with the Eucharistic 'fragment' (τὸ κλάσμα). I have found nothing in the text that would concretely establish this connection. However, it is quite plausible that they would have considered this 'fragment' and the cup as the 'spiritual food and drink' (10:3) that they had received [cf. Niederwimmer (1998), 158]. Consequently, their common participation in the Eucharistic elements would have been emblematic of their sharing in all things.

[77] καὶ ἄφες ἡμῖν τὴν ὀφειλὴν ἡμῶν, ὡς καὶ ἡμεῖς ἀφίεμεν τοῖς ὀφειλέταις ἡμῶν (*Did.* 8.2.).

[78] Milavec (2003d), 71.

Given the fact that the *Didache* gives specific instructions for the public confession of sins,[79] it seems unlikely that the communal recitation of the LP on the Lord's Day would have included a time of detailed public confession. But throughout the week, as the community members prayed the LP alone, or in small groups, this section of the LP may very well have led into a time of confession, and a declaration of inter-personal forgiveness.[80]

The important thing to bear in mind is that this petition provided a daily reinforcement of the community's ethos. The goal was perfection. However, they recognized that they were broken people, who continually fell short of God's standard for their lives. The confession of sin, the choice to forgive others and the assurance of forgiveness (from God and the community) were indispensable to community life. These actions reaffirmed the acceptance of each member and encouraged them to press on toward the goal of sanctification.

H. *Testing and Evil*

The communities prayed, 'do not lead us into testing, but deliver us from evil.'[81] With regard to the topic of evil, the text devotes significant attention to its description (chapters 2, 3, 5). Evil is the fundamental characterization of the path of death: 'But the way of death is this: first of all, it is evil.'[82] Evil is not thought of primarily as a spiritual power, but rather as a human choice.[83] Evil is manifest in sin: lust, murder, sorcery, robbery, etc. Humans decide whether or not they will walk in

[79] See *Did.* 4.14; 14.1.

[80] Milavec (2003b), 336, notes: 'It is quite probable that the Lord's Prayer was an "abstract" of the six key themes which invited expansion by gifted prayer leaders and also served as a summary prayer for those who lacked the gift of being able to improvise. Given the group orientation of the Lord's Prayer just considered, it would be hard to imagine that members of the Didache community assembled together to recite or hear recited a prayer which lasted twenty seconds. Rather, in the presence of a gifted prayer leader, one can expect that the Lord's Prayer served to indicate the progression of themes that were expanded upon and added to in accordance with the specific circumstances and perceived needs of those present.' See also Draper (2000), 139.

[81] καὶ μὴ εἰσενέγκῃς ἡμᾶς εἰς πειρασμόν, ἀλλὰ ῥῦσαι ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ τοῦ πονηροῦ (*Did.* 8.2).

[82] *Did.* 5.1, [Holmes (2007), 353]. The Greek reads: Η δὲ τοῦ θανάτου ὁδός ἐστιν αὕτη· πρῶτον πάντων πονηρά ἐστι.

[83] We have mentioned above the absence of the angels or spirits presiding over the two ways (*Did.* 1.1). We recall that the framers of the *Didache* removed these references from the Two Ways tradition so as to highlight the human responsibility in the doing of good and evil.

this way, and therefore the *Didache* implores its adherents to 'flee from evil of every kind and from anything resembling it.'[84] Victory over evil is the essence of sanctification. In the Eucharistic prayers, the community implores the Father to remember His church, 'to deliver it from all evil and to make it perfect in your love.'[85] Perfection was not imputed upon them. Perfection was something that they must obtain through their daily choice to walk on the path of life. Yet they could not attain to this ideal by themselves. 'Deliver us from evil' was an honest recognition of their own propensity to sin and their desperate need for God's assistance.

The power to resist evil would be the secret to victory amidst times of testing. Chapter 16 describes what the *Didache* communities believed to be a coming time of tribulation: 'Then all humankind will come to the fiery test, and many will fall away and perish; but those who endure in their faith will be saved by the accursed one himself.'[86] The petition 'do not lead us into testing,' did not signify a request for exemption from the coming time of tribulation. The assumption of the text is that it will be inevitable. Rather, the request to not be led (εἰσφέρω) into testing connoted their petition for preservation *through* these times.[87]

The communities were called to prepare themselves. They were as athletes in training. Discipled in the Way of Life, they were learning the discipline of daily righteousness. But any success during their *training* would be of no value to them if they failed the final test. Therefore, they were encouraged to strengthen one another: 'Gather together frequently, seeking the things that benefit your souls, for all the time you

[84] *Did*. 3.1, [Holmes (2007), 349)].

[85] *Did*. 10.5, [Holmes (2007), 361)]. The Greek reads: μνήσθητι, κύριε, τῆς ἐκκλησίας σου, τοῦ ῥύσασθαι αὐτὴν ἀπὸ παντὸς πονηροῦ καὶ τελειῶσαι αὐτὴν ἐν τῇ ἀγάπῃ σου.

[86] *Did*. 16.5, [Holmes (2007), 369)]. The Greek reads: τότε ἥξει ἡ κτίσις τῶν ἀνθρώπων εἰς τὴν πύρωσιν τῆς δοκιμασίας, καὶ σκανδαλισθήσονται πολλοὶ καὶ ἀπολοῦνται, οἱ δὲ ὑπομείναντες ἐν τῇ πίστει αὐτῶν σωθήσονται ὑπ᾽ αὐτου τοῦ καταθέματος. O'Loughlin (2003) has suggested that chapter 16 may originally have been the notes of a sermon. To be sure, the chapter is not written as treatise on eschatology, but as a practical admonition to the communities.

[87] E. F. Scott (1951), 49, compares this petition of the LP to an ancient Jewish prayer which reads, 'Give me a portion of thy Law and lead my feet into the power of thy commandment, and lead not my feet into the power of a transgression. Bring me not into the power of a sin, nor into the power of a temptation, nor into the power of evil.'

have believed will be of no use to you if you are not found perfect in the last time.'[88]

Although there is a strong futuristic element to the *Didache*'s presentation of evil and temptation, these petitions of the LP also had immediate significance for these Christians.[89] The necessary perfection in the 'last time' was attainable, but only as they would learn to walk in righteousness during *the time they had believed*. The choices to reject the Way of Death and choose the Way of Life were made each-and-every day.

As with the petitions for bread and forgiveness, these final petitions had vertical and horizontal elements. Their cry constituted a recognition of their need for the Father's help, and the help of others. 'Deliver *us* from evil and lead *us* not into testing,' once again reiterates the inseparability of the community. They would stand together or they would fall together.[90]

[88] *Did*. 16.2, [Holmes (2007), 367)]. The Greek reads: πυκνῶς δὲ συναχθήσεσθε ζητοῦντες τὰ ἀνήκοντα ταῖς ψυχαῖς ὑμῶν· οὐ γὰρ ὠφελήσει ὑμᾶς ὁ πᾶς χρόνος τῆς πίστεως ὑμῶν, ἐὰν μὴ ἐν τῷ ἐσχάτῳ καιρῷ τελειωθῆτε.

[89] Milavec (among many others) argues for an eschatological interpretation of the LP, and makes much of the aorist subjunctive that is used throughout the prayer. Milavec (2003b), 329, notes: 'The aorist tense is reserved for "one-time" events. Linguistically, therefore, just as the calling for the sanctification of the name and the arrival of the kingdom are one-time events, so, too, asking for the loaf using the aorist imperative presupposes that it will be given only once. All six petitions of the Lord's Prayer are framed in the aorist imperative. All six, therefore, anticipate a one-time fulfillment. The kingdom comes once. The loaf is given once. Our debt is forgiven once. We are preserved from failing "in the trial" once.' I disagree with this assessment, and find the argument from the Greek grammar particularly weak. Stagg (1972), 222, notes that, 'The fallacy of "theology in the aorist tense" stubbornly persists, even in the writings of distinguished scholars.' It is commonly understood that the aorist refers to 'punctiliar' action. Stagg (1972), 223, clarifies that this tense is to be understood as '"a-oristic," i.e., undetermined or undefined. The aorist draws no boundaries. It tells nothing about the nature of the action under consideration. It is "punctiliar" only in the sense that the action is viewed without reference to duration, interruption, completion, or anything else. What is "aoristic" belongs to semantics and not necessarily to the semantic situation. The aorist can properly be used to cover any kind of action: single or multiple, momentary or extended, broken or unbroken, completed or open-ended. The aorist simply refrains from describing.' Thus, the presence of the aorist in the LP does not signify that such action occurs ***once and only once***. The aorist imperative appears in the *Didache* eleven times outside of the LP. On three occasions, a reasonable case may be made for an eschatological, singular action: 'may your church be *gathered*' (*Did*. 9.4); 'may grace *come*' and 'may this world *pass away*' (*Did*. 10.6). In the other eight appearances, however, there is no implication that the these events occur once and only once, nor that they are futuristic: 'let your gift *sweat*' (*Did*. 1.6); '*fast*' (*Did*. 7.4); 'let no one *eat* or *drink*' (*Did*. 9.5); let apostles and everyone '*be welcomed*' (*Did*. 11.4, 12.1); '*earn his keep*' (*Did*. 12.3); and 'let no one *join*' (*Did*. 14.2).

[90] Before we move to the conclusion, a few brief comments on the final line the LP, 'For yours is the power and the glory,' are in order. This phrase was an antiphonal

I. *The Interpretation of the Lord's Prayer among the* Didache *Communities*

As the Christians of the *Didache* navigated the tension between order and chaos, the LP was the means by which they would set their hope upon the coming restoration, even as they worked through the challenges of daily life. The overarching emphasis of the first three petitions is the need for God's sanctifying work. As they called upon Him as Father, they recognized the intertwining of their identity with His own. In order that His name would be sanctified, they asked Him to make them holy. They prayed for the coming of the kingdom, the 're-gathering of the tribes,' which for them meant the hope of their imminent wholeness and perfection. And in asking God to do His will, they re-committed themselves to the Way of Life and sought His strength to live in righteousness.

The last four petitions of the LP are emblematic of the church's struggle to walk in righteousness on earth. They summarize the discipleship ethos of the *Didache*. This was the 'stuff' of their sanctification. In asking God for bread, they looked to Him to meet their material needs, even as they committed themselves to share with one another. As they acknowledged their need to receive and grant forgiveness, they embraced their own brokenness as a community, and found the resolve to press on toward holiness. And as they asked for God's help in times of testing and for victory over evil, they recognized the warfare in which they now engaged, and which would intensify in the 'last days.' With His assistance, and with encouragement from one another, they believed that they could be faithful until the end.

construction, similar to those found in the Eucharistic prayers (***Did***. 9.2, 3, 4; 10.2, 4, 5). Sandt and Flusser (2002), 294n note: 'Many scholars believe that this doxology draws upon the Davidic praise in 1 Chr 29:11-12 ... Surprisingly, in each of these Didache formulae the mention of "kingdom" is missing, while in I Chr 29:11-12 it is precisely three things that are connected, namely the kingdom, power and glory. The same triad also emerges in the secondary addition to Matt 6:13 of the Mss. K L W Θ Δ Π f13 and the "majority text." These doxologies indicate that both ***Did***. 8.2 and the secondary addition in Matt 6:13 reflect an ancient use of the Lord's prayer in Christian liturgy.'

This doxology reminds us that the recitation of the LP was a community discipline. It is probable that at times they would pray this prayer alone, but the primary setting for this prayer would have been in a group. [For a treatment of prayer gatherings, see Milavec (2003b), 333-336] The seven petitions of the LP served as an abstract for the prayer *session*, which contained both structured and spontaneous elements. Each petition introduced a theme, upon which the participants in the prayer were free to amplify. 'For yours is the power and the glory,' most likely served as a marker between each of the petitions.

IV. Conclusion

The Christians of the *Didache* saw themselves as moving toward sanctification. They held a very idealistic picture of their future perfection, yet they realized that as long as they were on the road, there would be sin and failure. Grace, patience, tolerance of disorder, and mutual encouragement fueled their continual progression upon the path of life. Their daily participation in the LP not only reminded them of God's plans for the nations and their role therein — it re-enforced the ethos that would make this purpose attainable.

The presentation of the LP in the *Didache* is unique in many respects. Throughout the course of this work, we have engaged with various early Christian communities, and we have seen the various functions that the LP played in their faith and worship. For some, the emphasis was on the symbolic significance of the prayer, for others, it was the theological vision articulated within. The concern of the *Didache* is not so much with semiotics or theology, but rather with practical discipleship. In the eyes of the community leaders, the overarching *function* of the LP was *identity formation.*

For these Christians, the idea of community did not reside in their rituals, doctrines, literary products or culture.[91] Rather, their identity was rooted in what they perceived to be the presence of God in their midst. Tom O'Loughlin notes that in this text

> there is a sharing of knowledge, of ethics, and of a common vision in this community but the community is not the result of those commonalities, rather those commonalities are a result of the work of the Spirit forming the people who enter the community that calls on God as Father and thus become the new Israel, the new vine (Did 9:2).[92]

In other words, the *Didache* fellowships perceived their identity as something that had been bestowed upon them by God. It was a gift. They had been made sons and daughters of the Father — and brothers and sisters of one another — through His initiative of grace.

[91] O'Loughlin (2003), 87, notes that 'texts, especially texts giving directions for group activities, exist within communities, and that the community has both a prior and more fundamental existence than its literary products. In short, the reality of Christianity in the first century is to be located in a community defined by its religious identity, not in texts.'

[92] O'Loughlin (2011), 82.

Consequently, the function of the LP among these Christians was not to *create* community. It was a means of reminding them of *what they already had*. It was a prayer that validated their *spirituality of the road*. Chaos and sin and failure were to be expected, as long as they maintained their commitment to stay on the path of life, and the hope for their future sanctification. They were a group of communities that that could be secure in their identity, even as they knew that they were far from perfect. It was the fostering of this security that the daily recitation of the LP accomplished in their midst.

CHAPTER FIVE: THE LORD'S PRAYER IN THE GOSPEL OF LUKE

I. Introduction

As we have looked at the LP through the eyes of Jesus, Matthew and the *Didache*, we have seen that the imagery, words, and metaphors which these authors employed to convey the meaning of the LP all belonged to the symbolic universe of first-century Judaism. This is to say that the semiotic domain within which they interpreted this prayer was culturally confined. As we now turn our attention to the Gospel of Luke, we discover a fascinating development in the effective history of the LP. This text represents the first documented attempt to transpose the LP from a *Jewish-Christian* to now a *Gentile-Christian* prayer. Pre-supposing a synchronic reading of his work, Luke was keenly aware that among his Gentile audience, every word of the LP would potentially be interpreted in the light of the Greco-Roman worldview. Many of his readers had only recently converted from paganism. Wanting, therefore, to keep the understanding of this prayer within carefully controlled boundaries, Luke employed a certain methodology in its presentation. He ensured that every major component of the LP would be amplified and demonstrated by the characters within the story. And those elements of the traditional prayer that were likely to be misinterpreted by his Gentile audience, he simply excised. The end result was a version of the LP that was concise, robust, and immanently applicable for a first-century Gentile Christian.

Luke's particular interpretation of the LP was the product of his missionary vision and strategy. He wrote the Luke-Acts narrative during a period which he considered to be crucial within the *Heilsgeschichte* ('Salvation History') of the church. Having borne witness to the ministry of

Jesus, the apostles and the early Christians, Luke had a deep concern that the missionary expansion of the faith should continue. Essential to the ongoing progress of the Christian movement would be the church's commitment to prayer. Just as Jesus, the disciples, and the first generation of believers had been committed to this endeavor, so too, his readers must have a vision for prayer. Every major 'move' of God thus far had come in response to prayer, and the continued activity of the Spirit to expand the church on earth would be fueled in the same manner.

For Luke, the function of the LP in the life of the church was simple: he wanted the people to *pray the prayer*, and *to do* what the prayer says. It was to be a ritual that spurred people to action. By comparison to his contemporary interpreters of the LP, Luke's treatment of this prayer does not share Matthew's dogmatic complexity, nor the *Didache*'s concern for its effect upon community discipleship. Applicability and simplicity were the driving forces behind his presentation. Luke wanted his people to pray; and he wanted them to live and proclaim the gospel of the kingdom that was the object of their prayer

Thus, Luke's interpretation is dominated by his pragmatic purposes. Set within the context of this narrative, the message of this prayer is one that fosters the relationships and the vision necessary for the church's continued health and expansion. It speaks of walking in a relationship of dependence and intimacy with the Father, so that the people will receive the Spirit that empowers them to do the works of the kingdom. Living as a community that values sharing, forgiveness and commitment to its missionary calling, they will receive the relational support and encouragement necessary for their perseverance.

Our present analysis will be divided into two parts. In the first section, we will look at the literary, historical and theological contexts of the LP in Luke-Acts. We will begin by evaluating the composition of Luke's audience, and then consider his eschatology, theology of prayer, and didactic methodology. In the second section, we will look at Luke's specific use and understanding of the LP within his overarching paraenesis on prayer.[1] Luke sought to teach what could be modeled, and he provided models for what he taught. Looking at the five petitions of the Lukan LP, we will see how he amply demonstrated the applica-

[1] The correlation between Luke's presentation of this prayer and the broader themes of Luke-Acts has not received considerable scholarly attention, as Holmas (2011), 131, comments: 'Given Luke's general interest in the theme of prayer, it is especially strange to note the paucity of study on how the Lukan "Our Father" fits into the overall profile of prayer in Luke-Acts.'

tion of this prayer's themes in the lives of his characters. Finally, we will conclude with an exploration of the elements of the LP that he may have excised, and his motives for doing so.[2]

II. The Context of the Lord's Prayer in Luke-Acts

A. Defining Luke's Audience

Throughout the twentieth century, there was a broad consensus among scholars that the four Evangelists wrote their books to address a specific *Sitz im Leben* of their respective communities. Gospel exegetes believed that it was possible to pinpoint the exact character (and sometimes even the exact location) of the audience for whom the authors wrote. This consensus, however, was challenged by Richard Bauckham and others in *The Gospel for All Christians* (1998), wherein attention was called to the difficulty of identifying *any* specific community to which the Gospel narratives were directed. Their contention was that the Gospels were written with a broad circulation in view, and that the intended audience included 'any and every Christian community in the late first-century Roman Empire.'[3]

The double work of Luke-Acts broadly supports Bauckham's assertions, in that it is the epitome of a story written for broad circulation. Johnson notes, 'Given the length, complexity, and literary sophistication of the work, it is far less likely that it responded to a specific or local crisis than that Luke intentionally addressed a much wider readership with magisterial ambition.'[4] It also is thought that, while not ignoring Jews and God-fearers,[5] Luke wrote for a predominantly Gentile audience living throughout the Diaspora. Among the reasons cited for this position are:

- The omission of Jewish preoccupations such as those found in Mt 5:21-48 and Mk 7:1-23.

[2] This, of course, will be an exercise in establishing plausibility. It cannot be proven that Luke shortened the prayer as he received it, anymore that it can be proven that Matthew and the *Didache* (in their seven-petition forms) are an amplification of the original. I shall here go against the consensus, and argue that Matthew and the *Didache* represent a form of the LP that predates Luke's version.

[3] Bauckham (1998), 1. For an excellent overview of the state of this debate, see Klink (2004).

[4] Johnson (1992), 404.

[5] See Ravens (1995), and Esler (1987), 44-45.

- The absence of Hebrew and Aramaic terms (which Luke translated into Greek) and his preference for the LXX when quoting the OT.[6]
- Luke's particular emphasis on the universal character of salvation,[7] and numerous accounts of Gentiles coming to faith.[8]
- Various geographical references which imply that his readers were not familiar with the area of Palestine.[9]
- The modification of terms (found in the other Synoptics) which would have been unfamiliar to a Diaspora audience.[10]
- Luke's exclusive naming of the Roman emperor during whose reign the events took place, and an explicit description of the political circumstances of Palestine.[11]

In light of these points, we conclude with Johnson that Luke's readers 'were almost certainly gentile,' and that, 'a great deal of Luke-Acts makes little sense if they were not gentile believers.'[12]

The people of Luke's audience were diverse with respect to their religious backgrounds and in their social makeup. Recent sociological research has revealed two important characteristics of Christianity in the first century. First, the faith was growing rapidly; and second, this growth was fueled in large part by urbanization.[13] Meeks has noted that, 'within a decade of the crucifixion of Jesus, the village culture of Palestine had been left behind, and the Greco-Roman city became the dominant environment of the Christian movement.'[14] Thus, as we envision the typical community reading Luke, we see a rapidly expanding group of house churches located within a complex Roman polis. Their

[6] Points 1 and 2 cited by Ravens (1995), 14.

[7] e.g., Lk 2:31-32; 3:5-6; 14:15-24.

[8] See Esler (1987), 34.

[9] e.g., Lk 2:4; 8:26; 19:29. Points 4-6 from Burton (1900).

[10] e.g., Lk 5:19; 8:24.

[11] See Lk 2:1; 1:5.

[12] Johnson (1992), 404.

[13] Stark (1997), 6, estimates that at this time, the faith was growing at a rate of 40% per decade. Meeks (1983), 25-26, notes that 'the rapid spread of Christianity through the lands of the Mediterranean basin was facilitated in manifold ways by the urbanization that had begun there before Alexander and accelerated during the Hellenistic and Roman imperial times.'

[14] Meeks (1983), 11.

context was colored by a multiplicity of languages, religions, social classes and levels of education.[15] And the Christian communities, to a large extent, reflected this diversity. Churches were a cross-section of their social environment: rich and poor, slaves and masters, Jews and gentiles from various ethnicities all formed part of their fellowships.[16]

Luke's target audience was not one specific sub-group. Rather, he wrote for all Christians.[17] His message addressed women, men, the rich, the poor, the educated, the uneducated, slaves, slave-owners, God-fearers, Jews, and former pagans. This is not to say, however, that he was unwilling to engage isolated segments of his audience at different points in his story. There was a versatility to the writing strategies Luke employed. There are sections of the Gospel where Luke appealed to the sensibilities of God-fearers and Jews.[18] And then there are other sections where he directed his message toward recently converted Gentiles.[19] His overarching objective was to make the whole of his narrative intelligible to the broadest audience possible.[20]

[15] Meeks (1983), 13, notes: 'As a consequence of Rome's entry into the East and her active interest in the Cities, urban society became somewhat more complex than it had been even during the Hellenistic age. For a very long time groups of foreigners had gathered in each city: merchants and artisans following the armies or in search of better markets or better access to transportation, persons enslaved and displaced by war or piracy and now set free, political exiles, soldiers of fortune.'

[16] See Meeks (1983), 73.

[17] Moxnes (1994), makes this point, basing his argument upon the social structures and relations which are described by Luke. He notes Luke's emphasis on the relationships between rich and poor and between men and women, thus placing 'Luke's characters within the context of vital power relations within the Hellenistic city.' [Moxnes (1994), 382] Additionally he cites 'material in Luke-Acts that pertains to Luke's evaluation of city culture, patronage, and the quest for honor' [Moxnes (1994), 383], particularly, the numerous passages which focus on meals and hospitality.

[18] e.g., Lk 1-3.

[19] e.g., Lk 13:29; 14:15-24; 24:47.

[20] There is no single 'implied reader' in Luke-Acts. Recently, some scholars have argued that Luke's 'ideal' audience can be narrowed down to only those who would find the information in his story intelligible and relevant. Okorie cites references to Israel's history (Lk 1:17, 32-33, 72-73); Jewish customs (Lk 1:8-10; 2:21, 41); the Law (2:22-24); and recent events in Palestine (Lk 3:19; 3:1-5), and argues that Luke's ideal readers were familiar with all of these. Okorie (1997), 228, requires that Luke's implied reader be familiar with everything: 'the general outlines of Roman governmental history and the specific governmental workings of the Middle East ... the Jewish religious practices of the synagogue and the Temple ... Israel's history and its dependence on the Law ... Jewish religious life ... local customs and social relations as well as historical events of first half of the first century.' I question how many people could realistically have met this criteria.

B. *Luke's Eschatology: The Mission of the Church in the Last Days*

Even as it has been the object of considerable scrutiny and refinement, Hans Conzelmann's *The Theology of Saint Luke* remains a cornerstone of contemporary Lukan studies. Central to his treatment of Luke is his thesis regarding the nature of the church within the Eschaton. In Conzelmann's framework, 'the outpouring of the Spirit is no longer itself the start of the Eschaton, but the beginning of a longer epoch, the period of the Church.' The Spirit is given to the believers, 'to exist in the continuing life of the world and in persecution, and He gives the power for missionary endeavor, and for endurance.' What results is a change in the understanding of eschatology that

> can be seen in the way in which Luke, by his description of history, depicts the nature of the Church, its relation to the world, and the course of the mission in its progress step by step, and in the way which he repeatedly describes the Spirit as power behind this whole process.'[21]

Thus, according to Conzelmann, Luke does not characterize the church as living on the cusp of the Parousia, and he envisions Spirit-empowered Christians having a significant mission in the world. Both of these points are well supported in Luke's narrative, and we now look at them more closely.

First, we note that there is a unique tone to Luke's presentation of the Parousia. Whereas the notion of an imminent consummation of the kingdom features prominently in the earliest Jesus traditions, Luke gently re-works this tradition in Luke-Acts. The Gospels of Matthew and

Esler (1987), 34-44, has argued that Luke's universalist tendencies point to a readership that includes Gentiles, but that a bias against ex-idolaters limits them to God-fearers. Such a view requires, as Esler admits, that Luke audience be limited to one specific church (which he proposes to be Ephesus).

In each case, we find that the over-application of the 'implied reader' methodology results in an intended audience that is implausibly narrow.

[21] Conzelmann (1960), 95-96. Conzelmann separated the Eschaton (characterized by the imminence of the Parousia) from Salvation History. This distinction has been challenged by many, including Marshall (1970), 109, who argued that, 'There is no either/or in primitive Christianity between eschatology and salvation-history. The eschatological events form part of salvation-history. In the tradition the ministry of Jesus is eschatological because in it God has begun His final action in the world.' My sympathies lie with Marshall, even as I uphold Conzelmann's characterization of the role and nature of the church in Luke-Acts.

Mark are pregnant with a sense of urgency,[22] as are the letters of Paul.[23] In Luke, however, 'The parousia was regarded as sudden rather than soon and transferred to the indefinite future rather than expected at any moment.'[24] He accomplished this shift by means of a tri-fold editorial strategy: first, the cataclysmic *telos* of Mark 13 is re-tooled, and spread out over an extended period of time;[25] second, the return of the Lord is delayed;[26] and third, the apocalyptic predictions of Joel 2:28-32 are fulfilled at Pentecost, and not at the 'end of the world.'[27] Although the notion of imminent expectation is not altogether removed in Luke-Acts,[28] it has been significantly diminished. As a consequence, new importance was given to the era of the Church. James Dunn remarks that Luke

> was in effect interposing a whole new epoch between the resurrection/ascension of Jesus and the parousia. Jesus' death and resurrection could no longer be regarded as the beginning of the End, the (final) eschatological climax, as Jesus and the first Christians had understood it, but rather as the mid-point of history, with an epoch stretching forward into the future on one side as well as one stretching back into the past on the other.[29]

The role of the church during this time was to be that of active mission. They weren't to be 'sitting on their hands' and 'killing time.' Rather, they were given the task of proclaiming the gospel to all nations.[30]

[22] e.g., Mk 9.1; 13.28-30; Mt 10.23

[23] Dunn (1990), 18-19, notes: 'Paul proclaimed the imminence of the parousia and the end (I Thess. 1.10; 4.13-18; I Cor. 7.29-31). Particularly worthy of notice is his preservation in I Cor. 16.22 of an Aramaic cry from the earliest church — "Maranatha, Our Lord, come!". It is scarcely possible that the earliest communities in Jerusalem and Palestine lacked this same sense of eschatological fervor and urgency.'

[24] Marshall 1970, (77-78). This is a synopsis of Conzelmann's thesis.

[25] See Lk 21.

[26] See Lk 12:38, 45; 19:11-27; Act 1:6-8.

[27] See Act 2:14-21. Cf. Conzelmann (1960), 95-136, and Dunn (1990), 343-348.

[28] Holmas (2011), 118, notes 'the significant number of references suggesting imminence (e.g. Lk. 9.27; 12.54-56; 18.7-8; 21.28, 32-33).'

[29] Dunn (1990), 348.

[30] Some recent scholars have suggested that this 'call to action' only applied to the characters in the Luke-Acts narrative, and not to Luke's actual readers. Holmas, in particular, has suggested that by the time Luke wrote, the church already viewed the 'glorious age of missions' as an object of the past. He posits that the period of gospel expansion had been very brief, and at the end of the first century, the church had already

In Luke's paradigm, the missionary task that has been given to the church will be complete only when the gospel reaches the 'end of the earth.'[31] This progression is essential to the theology of Luke, as Dupont has noted:

> In the Acts, by spreading out progressively from Jerusalem to Rome, the expansion of Christianity is not purely geographical; it passes from the Jewish to the Gentile world at the same time. This is precisely what interests Luke. With a remarkable insistence, he stresses that the evangelization of the Gentiles is not simply the result of fortuitous circumstances; willed by God, it fulfills the prophecies announced that the Messiah would bring salvation to the Pagan nations. It is therefore an integral part of the program assigned to the Christ by the Scriptures.[32]

As the book of Acts comes to a conclusion, this progression is only partially complete. Jews have been saved. God-fearers have been saved. But there is a paucity of accounts concerning the conversion of pagans.[33] It is in this light that Paul's final journey to Rome takes on such symbolic significance. Acts 28 is replete with prophetic foreshadowing: the kindness showed to Paul by pagans;[34] the rejection of his message by the Jews of Rome; and his declaration to them that, 'this salvation of God has been sent to the Gentiles; they will also listen.'(Acts 28:28) These

returned to a mode of waiting for the imminent return of Christ. While acknowledging Luke's delayed Parousia, he argues that Luke-Acts also conveys a sense of imminence. Holmas (2011), 118, notes that 'this tension can be resolved if we acknowledge that the temporal location of characters within the story in relation to the ultimate end can be different from that of Luke and his contemporaries ... by the time of Luke's writing events of the past — from the ultimate end, suggesting that now, when all this has taken place, the Parousia could be expected to be close at hand.' Hence, 'The glorious time marked by remarkable outpourings of the Spirit is future for the disciples within the setting of the Gospel story, but for Luke's readers it is past.' [Holmas (2011), 151] It is only to the characters in Luke's story that 'imminent participation in the eschatological harvest through the agency of the Spirit is the order of the day.' [Holmas (2011), 266]

Such an assertion is difficult to support in light of the rapid growth that church sustained throughout the first and second centuries, [see Stark (1997), 11-15]. If there ever were periods in the first three centuries wherein there was a lull in the church's growth, they were brief.

[31] See Act 1:7.

[32] From Bovon (2006), 366-367, who cites Dupont (1979).

[33] Cf. Esler (1987), 38-42. He notes that that subsequent to the story of Cornelius, there are an additional twenty conversion accounts in Acts. Almost all are Jews and God-fearers, and none explicitly relates the conversion of an idolater.

[34] See Act 28:7-10.

events hardly represent the ending of the church's mission. Rather, for Luke's audience, they mark the beginning of a new era. On the lips of Paul, Luke is passing on the torch to the next generation of believers. The gospel has crossed the frontier of the city which symbolized the 'ends of the earth.' Now, for Luke's readers, the work will begin in earnest. As Plymale notes, 'Luke is inviting his readers to participate in the divine saga.'[35]

C. *Luke's Theology of Prayer*

Luke has been noted for his proclivity to imbue historical events with theological significance. He is eager to demonstrate that God's good nature and righteous character are revealed through His dealings with humanity. Nowhere is this concern more prominent than in his presentation of prayer. In Luke-Acts, the simple proposition *God answers prayer* becomes the foundation of both paraenesis and historical account. The central characters in Luke's story pray, they teach on prayer, and they see answers to their prayer.

In consideration of Luke's endeavor as a historian, we note the simple fact that prayer features prominently in both the activities and speech of Luke's protagonists. His story is saturated with accounts of praying people: the godly Jews who await the Messiah's coming;[36] Jesus;[37] the early disciples;[38] the Jerusalem church;[39] Peter;[40] Paul;[41] Paul and the elders in Ephesus;[42] Paul and the Christians in Tyre;[43] Cornelius;[44] and the church in Antioch.[45] Luke far surpasses any other NT author in his attention to the topic of prayer,[46] and it is significant to note that

[35] Plymale (1991), 105.

[36] Lk 1:10, 46, 68; 2:38.

[37] Lk 3:21; 5:16; 6:12; 9:18; 10:21-22; 11:1; 22:41.

[38] Act 1:14, 24; 3:1; 6:4, 6.

[39] Act 2:42; 4:31; 12:12.

[40] Act 9:40; 10:9.

[41] Act 9:11; 14:23; 16:25; 22:17; 28:8.

[42] Act 20:36.

[43] Act 21:5.

[44] Act 10:2.

[45] Act 13:3.

[46] Smalley (1973), 59, notes that, 'The verb προσεύχομαι (meaning "to offer petition") is used ... 19 times in the Gospel of Luke alone; including Acts, 35 of the 86

his Gospel contains numerous accounts of people at prayer that are altogether absent in Matthew or Mark.[47]

Apart from this quantitative measure of Luke's interest in prayer, we also discover in Luke-Acts a detailed and profound theology of prayer. This theology is intrinsically bound up with Luke's concept of the *Heilsgeschichte*. Three broad periods are to be identified within his historical framework: 1) The period of Israel, ('the Law and the Prophets'), 2) The period of Jesus, and 3) The period between the first and second advents of Jesus, which is, 'the period of the Church and of the Spirit.'[48] In each of these stages, prayer plays a key role in the progression of God's plan.

The first stage is figuratively presented in the characters of the godly Jewish men and women who pray throughout the birth accounts of John the Baptist and Jesus.[49] Luke's primary concern is to demonstrate that the period of Israel is coming to an end. This era had, in many ways, been characterized by unanswered prayer.[50] Yet, the prophets had also spoken of a time when God would once again listen to his people.[51] Luke seeks to demonstrate that this time of 'answered prayer' has arrived. Hence, the narrative begins with various accounts of Jewish women and men at prayer: the people outside the temple pray as Zechariah offers the sacrifice;[52] Mary prays when she visits Elizabeth;[53] Zechariah prays and prophesies at John's birth;[54] Simeon[55] and Anna[56] both pray when they embrace the boy Jesus. All the hopes and longings of Israel are expressed in these prayers, and each one will find its fulfillment within Luke's story. What Luke seeks to communicate about the first

New Testament occurrences of the word appear in the Lucan writings. If cognates are included, the figure rises to 57.'

47 e.g., Jesus' prayer at baptism (LK 3:21); before choosing the disciples (Lk 6:12); at Caesarea Philippi (Lk 9:18); at the transfiguration (Lk 9:28, 29); prior to teaching the LP (Lk 11:1); the prayer parables (Lk 11:5-8; 18:1-8); prayer for Peter (Lk 22:31-32); and the exhortation to the disciples (Lk 22:40). Kyu (2000), 675, notes that the Gospel of Luke contains sixteen references to prayer which were not found in his sources.

48 Conzelmann (1960), 150.

49 See Lk 1-2.

50 See Isa 1:15; 59:2.

51 See Isa 58:9; 65:17, 24; 56:6-7; Mal 1:11.

52 Lk 1:10.

53 Lk 1:46.

54 Lk 1:68.

55 Lk 2:29-32.

56 Lk 2:38.

stage in Salvation History is that Israel's time of waiting and expectancy are over. A new era of salvation has begun in which God will once again respond to the prayers of His people.[57]

As the Lukan narrative then moves into stages two and three of the *Heilsgeschichte*, prayer features more and more prominently. With each significant development, at every major turning point, in the midst of each crisis — God's people are to be found at prayer. The model is first established by Jesus: in prayer he launches his public ministry;[58] praying, he receives the Holy Spirit;[59] praying, he is transfigured;[60] he prays before choosing his disciples;[61] it is in prayer that he undergirds their period of training;[62] he prays before his crucifixion;[63] he prays on the cross;[64] Jesus teaches his disciples *how* to pray;[65] and he urges them to *persist* in prayer.[66]

Subsequently, this pattern of prayer continues among the disciples and the church: they pray in Jerusalem, and the Holy Spirit falls upon them;[67] it is in prayer that they stand firm amidst persecution, and find boldness to proclaim the message;[68] Stephen prays as he is martyred;[69] Paul's commissioning as an apostle comes as he prays;[70] it is because of Cornelius' prayers that salvation comes to his house;[71] it is in prayer that Peter receives the revelation of God's salvific plan for the Gentiles;[72] and it is in prayer that Paul and Silas are commissioned as missionaries.[73]

57 These insights are from Conn (1972).

58 Lk 4:1-13.

59 Lk 3:21-23. Compare Mk 1:9-11; Mt 3:13-17.

60 Lk 9:28-36. Compare Mk 9:2-4; Mt 17:1-2.

61 Lk 6:12. Compare Mk 3:13-14.

62 Lk 10:21-22.

63 Lk 22:39-44.

64 Lk 23:34, 46.

65 Lk 11:2-4.

66 Lk 11:5-13; 18:1-8.

67 Act 1:14; 2:1-4.

68 Act 4:24-30.

69 Act 7: 59-60.

70 Act 9:10-19.

71 Act 10:4.

72 Act 10:9-16.

73 Act 13:2-3.

Throughout the entire narrative, the correlation between human prayer and God's activity is abundantly clear.

Prayer is a determining factor in the unfolding of the *Heilsgeschichte.* God's divine plan of salvation is driven forward by the prayers of Jesus and his followers.[74] Plymale concludes that, 'Prayer is God's way of guiding and implementing the accomplishment of His will.'[75] Luke goes to great lengths to model prayer, to teach on prayer, and to document prayer being answered — because he believes that God shapes the world by means of prayer.[76] This is Luke's theology. He does not present every detail of human history unfolding according a divinely written script. Rather, men and women must pray in order for God's purposes to come to pass.

In support of this characterization of Luke's theology, I note the following points:

1) Luke maintains an emphasis on the notion of divine initiative. The purpose of God (ἡ βουλῆ τοῦ θεοῦ) for the salvation of hu-

[74] This view has been articulated by Smalley (1973) and Plymale (1991).

[75] Plymale (1991), 105.

[76] An alternative perspective is to be found among Reformed theologians, who have insisted that Luke conceived of God's will as independent, immutable, and thus in no way influenced by any human activity, including prayer. Representing this school of thought, Crump (1992), 6, asks: 'Is it quite correct to say that prayer is the means by which God guides salvation-history? ... in view of Luke's concern with the sovereignty of God and ... with the way in which prayer serves to attune the will of the individual to the will of God, would it not be more correct to say that Luke reveals various ways in which God is already guiding salvation-history, and prayer is a means of human perception of, and thus participation in, what God is doing?' Crump (1992), 135, notes further: 'God enlists human prayer in the outworking of his plan, but the efficacy of prayer is not determined by anything which the prayer brings, except agreement with the will of God.'

In this line of thought, believers participate in the doing of God's will as they perceive what God is doing. They themselves do not a play an active role in influencing God, or swaying Him in any way. In such a case, Luke's insistence on the need for Christians to pray is ultimately a pastoral concern. Prayer cannot add nor subtract from the pre-determined activity of God. Hence, prayer is for the benefit of the believer herself — for her own peace-of-mind, for a spirit of faithfulness and for the strength to persevere until the end.

I concur with Holmas (2011), 12-13, in his critique of Crump: 'A strong emphasis on divine sovereignty as the setting for Lukan prayer marks Crump's interpretation, but his view in this regard appears to be more informed by theological prejudice than by the thought world of Luke-Acts. It is difficult to avoid the impression that Crump's exegesis is carried out with doctrinal, even denominational, bias.'

manity is foreknown, that is, it precedes human initiative or activity.[77]

2) Luke does not, however, present the βουλῇ τοῦ θεοῦ as an all-encompassing predetermination of human activity. There is an independence of the human will, wherein men are capable of formulating their own plans, which at times stand in opposition to the purpose of God.[78]
3) Consequently, salvation is not predetermined on an individual basis,[79] but rather is made possible to all through the predestined work of Christ.[80]
4) The work of Satan stands in opposition to the purpose of God. He keeps people in darkness;[81] he causes physical disabilities which God does not will;[82] he offers alternative routes to the plan of God;[83] and he tempts believers to lie[84] and to commit acts of betrayal.[85]
5) The parables in Lk 11:5-13 and Lk 18:1-8 teach that persistence is necessary in order for God's will to be done. This is not because of God's unwillingness to answer. These stories allude to difficult circumstances, human hardness-of-heart, and discouragement. All these stand in opposition to the doing of God's will, and must

[77] See Act 2:23; 4:28. The notion of Divine initiative is also seen Act 17:26-27, where Paul describes God's providential determination of 'allotted periods' and 'boundaries' for humanity. It should be noted however, that the Divine initiative does not (in Luke's view) preclude the free exercise of human will. Paul here goes on say that God's purpose in the predetermination of certain aspects of the human experience is carried out so that they 'should seek God, and perhaps feel their way toward him and find him.'

[78] See Lk 23:51: τῇ βουλῇ καὶ τῇ πράξει αὐτῶν; Act 5:38: ᾖ ἐξ ἀνθρώπων ἡ βουλὴ αὕτη ἢ τὸ ἔργον τοῦτο.

[79] For a full treatment of this matter see Conzelmann (1960), 152-157. He notes, 'God's plan is primarily concerned with the saving events as a whole, not with the individual man and his destiny. According to it redemptive history leads up to Christ, and then on to the Last Judgment. The predestination of the individual has not yet come to expression in the conception of the plan. We can see this from the abstract way in which the motif of 'election' is expressed... Luke is not familiar with a fixed number of elect.' [Conzelmann (1960), 154] Act 13:48 provides the only evidence to the contrary.

[80] See Lk 24: 44-49; Act 26:15-18.

[81] Act 26:18.

[82] Lk 13:11-16.

[83] Lk 4:3-13.

[84] Act 5:3.

[85] Lk 22:31.

therefore be combated in prayer. Prayer is the key to overcoming both temptation and despondency.[86]

6) Perseverance in prayer is described by Jesus as *faithfulness* (πίστις). He questioned whether he would find men praying at the time of his return,[87] implying that prayer is a human choice and not a divinely controlled activity.

Luke's perspective on the causative relationship between prayer and the unfolding of the *Heilsgeschichte* can thus be summarized as follows: The initiative of salvation belongs to God. But given the independence of the human will, and the opposition to God which arises from both men and Satan — collaboration with God through persistent prayer is necessary in order for men to come to salvation.

Overall, it is this conviction of necessity that drives the Lukan presentation of prayer. Luke takes great pains to characterize his protagonists as people of prayer. He lays out a theological paradigm for the era of answered prayer. He demonstrates the power of prayer at key turning points in the story. He highlights Jesus' teaching on prayer. None of this would make sense if Luke did not believe that prayer was somehow necessary to the fulfillment of the church's missionary task.

D. *Luke's Didactic Methodology: Modeling and Application*

Luke's writings reveal a proclivity for tangible, 'real-life' demonstration of his paraenesis. This strategy is first noted in his Gospel, wherein Jesus' devotion to prayer is given as a model to emulate. Holmas notes,

> The copiousness of prayer education in Luke's Gospel is testament to the essentially didactic function of the prayer emphasis also evidenced in the episodic references to Jesus' prayer, targeting the reader to emulate the principles and paradigms provided by the historical account.[88]

This didactic strategy extends into the book of Acts, wherein Luke seeks to demonstrate that the apostles and the early church are following the example and teaching of Jesus. It has often been noted that Luke wrote the second book in order to portray the application of Jesus' teachings

[86] Lk 22:39-46.

[87] Lk 18:8.

[88] Holmas (2011), 115.

and the significance of his redemptive work in the life of the church.[89] This objective certainly characterizes the treatment of prayer in Acts, 'where the early community and its leading personalities are portrayed as ideally dedicated to prayer after the example and precept of Jesus. What Jesus prescribes in the Gospel, the community of believers obediently executes in the Acts story.'[90] Holmas has noted various parallels between the prescription in the Gospel, and its subsequent application in the Acts.[91] We note the following examples:

Model: Jesus prays before choosing the disciples. (Lk. 6:12-16)
Instruction: Jesus instructs his disciples to pray for laborers. (Lk 10:2)
Praxis: The disciples pray before choosing Judas' successor. (Acts 1: 24-25)

Model: Jesus in prayer receives the Holy Spirit. (Lk. 3:21-22)
Instruction: Jesus instructs the disciples to ask for the Holy Spirit. (Lk 11:13)
Praxis: The disciples pray and receive the Holy Spirit. (Acts 1:14; 2:1-4; 4:24-31)

Model: Jesus prays and asks forgiveness for his enemies. (Lk 23:34)
Instruction: Jesus instructs his disciples to pray for their enemies. (Lk. 6:28)
Praxis: Stephen prays for the forgiveness of his enemies (Acts 7:60).[92]

Luke thus employs a paraenetic methodology in which the desired practice of prayer is modeled by Jesus, taught by Jesus — and then put into practice by the disciples and the early church.

Luke calls his readers to follow this pattern of prayer, because he expects them to see the same results as the characters in his narrative. He envisions his generation as the continuation of Acts. As they follow the teaching of Jesus, the example of Jesus, and the example of the disciples — they are to expect the same outcomes: the outpouring of the Holy

[89] So Dupont: 'This is the reason Luke wanted to add the account of the apostolic mission to that of Jesus' life; without it, the work of salvation described by the messianic prophecies would not be complete.' [cited by Bovon (2006), 366-367]

[90] Holmas (2011), 154.

[91] Holmas (2011), 162.

[92] See also: Lk. 2.36-38 (Anna in prayer); Lk 18.1-8 (prayer exhortation); Act 14.22-23; 20.32; 26.6-7.

Spirit, new advances in their missionary outreach, and strength to persevere amidst trials and persecution.[93]

E. Concluding Remarks on the Context of the Lord's Prayer in Luke-Acts

Thus far, we have noted certain characteristics of Luke's audience, and we have highlighted the paraenetic framework within which he seeks to engage his readers on the topic of prayer. Namely, Luke addresses urban churches with a predominantly Gentile makeup. His purpose in writing them incorporates a call to action and a call to prayer. In the previous generation, the gospel had progressed all the way to Rome, the city which represents 'all the nations.' But the task remains unfinished.

We have also seen that Luke historically documents the facts that Jesus and the early disciples were people of prayer. He demonstrates the efficacy of prayer. God's plan of salvation has advanced thus far on the wings of prayer, and Luke now exhorts his readers to persevere in prayer so that that the fullness of God's salvific purpose can become reality. It is in this context that he presents the LP to his readers.

III. Luke's Presentation of the Lord's Prayer

A. The Lord's Prayer as a Ritual Discipline

Although the Luke-Acts narrative gives no explicit examples of Jesus or the disciples praying the LP, there are indications in the Acts that the LP was recited daily by the early Christians. Acts 2:42 states, 'And they devoted themselves to the apostles' teaching and the fellowship, to the breaking of bread and the prayers.' Notable in this particular verse is the

[93] I am strenuously against Franklin (1975), 165 who comments: 'though his two volumes are descriptive and so indirectly have an influence upon the lives of his own generation, his work is not set forth as an ideal which is to be imitated by others, but as an account of the past in order to bring men to a particular decision in the present. He is not out to edify the Church by equipping it for a continuing role, but, by giving a description of its origins, to recall the Christian community to the true nature of its being and to bring about a particular aim in a definite situation, to reawaken faith, encourage constancy, and restore hope.' He continues: 'Luke does not appear to encourage his readers to engage in missionary activity, nor does he have material which sees their lives as witnesses to the world in which they are set.' [Franklin (1975), 166]

grammatical form of 'the prayers' (ταῖς προσευχαῖς).[94] Many scholars have noted that the plural form of προσευχή with the article points to the practice of fixed prayer.[95] Considering this in the light of Acts 3:1 (which states that, 'Peter and John were going up to the temple at the hour of prayer'), the indication seems to be that the early Jewish followers of Christ continued to participate in the daily prayers of the Temple.[96] If they were indeed saying fixed prayers at set times, there can be no doubt that the LP figured as part of this ritual. Albeit in an allusive fashion, Luke is signaling to his readers that the LP is to be prayed three times a day.[97]

B. Father

In Luke 11:2, Jesus instructs his disciples to simply address God as 'Father.' In distinction to what we observed in the Gospel of Matthew, Luke does not seek to create a contrast of character between (inadequate) earthly fathers and the (perfect) heavenly Father. The actual fathers in his narrative are good: Zechariah is filled with Holy Spirit and prophesies;[98] Joseph is a godly figure;[99] the father of the demon-possessed boy is compassionate and caring;[100] and in the parable of the prodigal son, the father is a loving and merciful man.[101] Given this favorable impression of earthly fathers, it is not surprising that in one particular teaching on prayer (Lk 11: 11-13), Jesus appeals to the good character of the human father figure as an illustration of God's paternal heart. In setting up this comparison, he first asks, 'What father among you, if his son asks for a fish, will instead of a fish give him a serpent; or if he asks for an egg, will give him a scorpion?' (Lk 11:11-12) To further emphasize his point, Jesus then goes on to suggest that the love of earthly fathers is so great, that it mitigates their unrighteous character; being

[94] This precise morphology (without a possessive noun or pronoun) appears only one other time in the NT, 1 Tim 5:5 καὶ προσμένει ταῖς δεήσεσιν καὶ ταῖς προσευχαῖς νυκτὸς καὶ ἡμέρας. This particular reference neither supports nor negates my position.

[95] Cf. Holmas (2011), 177.

[96] Holmas (2011), 177, disputes the notion that Christians continued to pray at the Temple and attributes this verse to Luke's 'apologetic of the Jesus movement vis-à-vis Judaism.' Given the fact that at this point in history, there had been no formal break between the followers of Jesus and Judaism, I see no reason not to take Act 3:11 at 'face value.'

[97] Such a custom would be consistent with that prescribed by *Didache* 8:3.

[98] Lk 1:67.

[99] Lk 2:33.

[100] Lk 9:38.

[101] Lk 15:12-32.

evil, they still give good gifts to their children.[102] He then concludes, 'how much more will the heavenly Father give the Holy Spirit to those who ask him.'(Lk 11:13b) Thus, Luke's basic assumption is that there is a fatherly goodness on earth, and it is upon this basis that he illustrates the character and generosity of the heavenly Father.

As Luke develops his image of the Father, he employs a method wherein the paternal characteristics of God are described in words, and depicted in application. The Father is characterized as merciful,[103] and in application, forgiveness is at the very core of the gospel *kerygma*.[104] Luke describes the Father as willing to give the Holy Spirit,[105] and in application, the Holy Spirit comes.[106] Luke describes the Father as knowing the disciples' need for food and clothing, and in application their material needs are always met.[107] Luke says that it is the, 'Father's good pleasure to give you the kingdom,'[108] and in application the secrets of the kingdom are given to the disciples.[109] Everything that Luke posits as a characteristic of the Father is then manifest in His tangible dealings with humanity.

However, the *clearest* manifestation of the Father's character is Jesus himself. Jesus said, 'All things have been handed over to me by my Father, and no one knows who the Son is except the Father, or who the Father is except the Son and anyone to whom the Son chooses to reveal him.'(Lk 10:22) In this (very Johannine) declaration, Jesus is proclaiming that the Father can only be known through him. Jesus stands in special relationship to the Father, and he extends this relationship to those who follow him. Luke in this way provides his readers with a path of absolute certainty. To know Jesus and to follow his teachings is to know the Father.

Thus, Luke has created a literary context in which addressing God as Father evokes positive imagery. Earthly fathers have been portrayed as loving, merciful and attentive to the needs of their children — and the heavenly Father is the epitome of this goodness. Just as Jesus addressed God as Father,[110] so he invited his followers to call upon God in

[102] Lk 11:13a.

[103] Lk 6:36.

[104] Lk 24:47.

[105] Lk 11:13; 24:49; Act 1:4.

[106] Act 2:4.

[107] Act 2:45; 4:35.

[108] Lk 12:32.

[109] Lk 8:10.

[110] See Lk 22:42; 23:34, 46.

the same manner. Yet even more profoundly, Luke has set Jesus as the ultimate embodiment of the Father's character. Anyone who has known Jesus knows the Father.[111]

C. *The Sanctification of God's Name*

Jesus taught his followers to pray, 'hallowed be your name.'[112] In the writings of the Prophets, the sanctification of the divine name denoted the initiative of God to reveal His power, and the consequent honor which women and men ascribed to Him. God declared in Ezekiel 36:23 'I will sanctify my great name,'[113] and in Isaiah 29:23, 'they will sanctify my name.'[114] In the double work, Luke presents the sanctification of God's name in this same reflexive pattern. God makes His name holy by demonstrating His power, and the people make His name holy by recognizing His deeds. We shall see that it is a particular concern of Luke to convey that the deeds of God are done *through* Jesus. Thus, the Father's initiative to sanctify His name is now realized in His son. God's name is reflexively sanctified by the men who recognize Jesus as the agent of the Father. As Luke develops this point, he does so progressively. The basis upon which the Father's name is sanctified in the Gospel, will climactically become the rationale for sanctifying Jesus' name in the Acts.

The notion of sanctifying God's name first appears in the *Magnificat*,[115] wherein Luke accomplishes two goals. First, he establishes that the sanctification of the name requires both the manifestation of God's deeds and the human recognition of what He has done. Second, insomuch as the *Magnificat* is a programmatic blueprint for the ministry of Jesus,[116] Luke lays the groundwork upon which the honoring of Jesus' name will become tantamount to the honoring the name of the Father.

[111] In Luke's view, this would apply to knowing Jesus as an eyewitness or through the testimony of others. Luke's objective in writing his Gospel was that that his readers would have certainty concerning the things they had been taught (Lk 1:4). I.e., he wanted them to be sure that the testimony they had received of Jesus was, in fact, true.

[112] ἁγιασθήτω τὸ ὄνομά σου (Lk 11:2).

[113] This citation is from the NRSV, which gives a more literal translation of the Hebrew:

וְקִדַּשְׁתִּ֞י אֶת־שְׁמִ֣י הַגָּד֗וֹל

Note also the LXX: καὶ ἁγιάσω τὸ ὄνομά μου τὸ μέγα.

[114] BHS: יַקְדִּ֣ישׁוּ שְׁמִ֑י

LXX: δι' ἐμὲ ἁγιάσουσιν τὸ ὄνομά μου.

[115] Lk 1:46-55.

[116] Cf. Marshall (1991).

With regard to the first point, Mary sanctifies God's name because of what He does: 'My soul magnifies the Lord ... my spirit rejoices in God... *because* (ὅτι) he has looked upon the lowliness of his servant.'[117] And again, 'Because (ὅτι) the Mighty One has done great things for me, even so his name is holy.'[118] Verses 50-54 declare His deeds: He shows mercy; He demonstrates His strength; He scatters the proud; He exalts the humble; He feeds the hungry, He sends away the rich; He helps Israel. Luke is again revealing his proclivity for tangible demonstration. The shear concept of the holiness of God's name is too abstract of a notion for Luke. It must be illustrated by what he does. Mary sanctifies His name by declaring His deeds. With regard to the second point, Mary's 'grocery list' of saving acts is a programmatic foreshadowing of the life of Jesus: he has mercy on the ten lepers;[119] he sends away the rich young ruler;[120] he condemns the rich and powerful;[121] he publicly praises the poor widow;[122] and he feeds the multitude.[123] Everything that Mary characterizes as 'great' (μεγάλα) is subsequently manifest in the life of Jesus. Thus, the greatness of the Mighty One is demonstrated through the life of His servant Jesus. It is for these reasons that Jesus can say that the Father is revealed through him.[124]

This conflation of the Father's/Jesus' deeds is reinforced in Luke-Acts by the gradual replacement of 'the name of the Lord' with the 'the name of Jesus.' Subsequent to Mary's declaration, 'holy is his name,' there are only two other references to the name of the Lord.[125] Both refer to the blessing of the one 'who comes in the name of Lord.' Throughout most of Luke, the name of Jesus is not given soteriological significance,[126]

[117] My paraphrased translation. The full text reads, Μεγαλύνει ἡ ψυχή μου τὸν κύριον, καὶ ἠγαλλίασεν τὸ πνεῦμά μου ἐπὶ τῷ θεῷ τῷ σωτῆρί μου, ὅτι ἐπέβλεψεν ἐπὶ τὴν ταπείνωσιν τῆς δούλης αὐτοῦ (Lk 1:46b-48a).

[118] Lk 1:49, my translation. The Greek reads, ὅτι ἐποίησὲν μοι μεγάλα ὁ δυνατός. καὶ ἅγι●ν τὸ ὄνομα αὐτ●ῦ.

[119] Lk 17:11-14.

[120] Lk 18:18-25.

[121] Lk 6:24-26.

[122] Lk 21:1-4.

[123] See Lk 9:12-17.

[124] See Lk 10:22.

[125] See Lk 13:35; 19:38.

[126] Cf. Lk 9:48 (receiving children in his name); Lk 9:49; 10:17 (casting out demons in his name); Lk 21:8 (false prophets in his name); and Lk 21:8, 17 (persecution in his name).

until the last chapter where it says, 'that repentance and forgiveness of sins should be proclaimed in his name to all nations.' (Lk 24:47) From that point on, throughout the book of Acts, 'the name of Jesus' is the indispensable marker of God's saving deeds.[127] The church implores the Father: 'grant to your servants to continue to speak your word with all boldness, while you stretch out your hand to heal, and signs and wonders are performed through the name of your holy servant Jesus.'(Acts 4:29, 30) Jesus is the agent of the Father. He is the one through whom God's deeds are manifest on earth.

The readers of Luke-Acts have come to see that the holiness of God's name, as initially proclaimed by Mary, is ultimately articulated in the name of Jesus Christ. Thus, the petition 'hallowed be your name' constitutes a request for God to sanctify His name as He reveals His saving power on earth through the person of Jesus Christ. This petition also expresses the hope that as women and men see God's works, they will, as Mary, give God His due recognition — declaring 'holy is his name' as they consider all that He has done.

D. Your Kingdom Come

Luke's version of the LP incorporates the petition, 'your kingdom come.'[128] In the double work, Luke makes no attempt at theological innovation with regard to this term. On the contrary, he often employs 'the kingdom of God' as a broad summary of the gospel ***kerygma***.[129] When Luke does offer insight into his particular understanding of the kingdom, its broad features are consistent with what is observed throughout the synoptics. For example, the kingdom is both a present reality and a future event.[130] The tension between *the now and the not yet* finds expression in Luke's writings just as it does throughout the New Testament.

[127] In the Acts, there are two references to the 'name of the Lord' which are not explicitly referring to Jesus (Act 2:21; 15:17) and both are quotations from the OT. Every other reference to the power of God's name is explicitly connoted by the name of Jesus. See 'the name of Jesus' in: Act 2:28; 3:6; 3:16; 4:10; 4:12; 4:18; 4:30; 8:12; 10:48; 16:18; 26:9; and 'the name of the Lord Jesus': Act 8:16; 15:26; 19:5; 19:13; 21:13.

[128] ἐλθέτω ἡ βασιλεία σου (Lk 11.2).

[129] e.g., Act 19:8: 'And he entered the synagogue and for three months spoke boldly, reasoning and persuading them about the kingdom of God.' See also Act 1:3; 8:12; 20:35; 28:23, 31.

[130] See, for example, Lk 11:20 and 22:18.

If there is a particular concern for Luke on this topic, it is the connection between the kingdom and the presence of the Holy Spirit. James Dunn has called attention to a complimentary association in Luke-Acts between the Spirit and the kingdom.[131] He notes, for example, the interplay of *Spirit* and *kingdom* in Acts 1:3-8. In verse 3 Jesus speaks to the disciples about the *kingdom*; in verses 4-5 he instructs them to wait for the *Spirit*; in verse 6 they ask when the *kingdom* will come; and then in verses 7-8 Jesus tells them that it is not for them to know the times, but that they will receive *Spirit*. Hence, in response to their question regarding the kingdom, Jesus replies speaking of the Spirit. Dunn paraphrases Jesus' response in this way: 'Do not concern yourselves about the *when* of the kingdom; as to the *what* of the kingdom, that which concerns you is that you shall receive power when the Holy Spirit comes upon you.'[132] What Luke seeks to convey in this passage is that the kingdom of God is ushered in by the work of the Spirit. If the disciples are eager to see the kingdom, then they must seek the Spirit.

Smalley has taken Dunn's observations one step further, documenting in Luke-Acts a triadic relationship between the Spirit, the kingdom and prayer. He notes

> Luke ... regards petitionary prayer as the means by which the dynamic power of God's Spirit is historically realised for purposes of salvation. Luke's theological understanding, moreover, is such that he also views the activity of the Spirit among men and the arrival of the kingdom of God as aligned if not synonymous.'[133]

Looking at this from another angle, we recall that the ultimate objective of prayer is the attainment of the Holy Spirit. Luke 11:1-13, which stands at the very core Luke's paraenesis on prayer, culminates with a reiteration of the Father's disposition to give the Spirit: 'If you then, who are evil, know how to give good gifts to your children, how much more will the heavenly Father give the Holy Spirit to those who ask him!'(Lk 11:13) The Holy Spirit is the recapitulation of all that the believer seeks in prayer.[134] Consequently, when the disciples ask for the kingdom, Jesus

[131] Dunn (1998), 133-141.

[132] Dunn (1998), 137.

[133] Smalley (1973), 68.

[134] Compare to Mt 7:11: 'If you then, who are evil, know how to give good gifts to your children, how much more will your Father who is in heaven give good things to those who ask him!'

tells them to seek the Spirit. We may conclude, then, that Luke intends his readers to equate the petition 'your kingdom come,' with a request for the Spirit to come in fullness upon them. Prayer for the Sprit and prayer for the kingdom are one-and-the-same.[135]

E. The Provision of Bread

The Lukan version of the LP includes the petition, 'Give us each day our daily bread.'[136] It has often been noted that Luke's construction of this petition is slightly different than that seen in Matthew and the *Didache*. The latter texts read, τὸν ἄρτον ἡμῶν τὸν ἐπιούσιον δὸς ἡμῖν σήμερον, with the verb δίδωμι (to give) in the aorist tense (signifying punctiliar action) and the indication of frequency being simply σήμερον (today). In the Lukan reading, the petition is τὸν ἄρτον ἡμῶν τὸν ἐπιούσιον δίδου ἡμῖν τὸ καθ' ἡμέραν. The verb δίδωμι is conjugated in the active form (signifying continual action), and the indication of frequency is τὸ καθ' ἡμέραν, (every day).[137] These variations are partly stylistic,[138] even as Luke's wording does give emphasis to the repetitive, daily nature of this request.

In his article, '"Panem Nostrum": The Problem of Petition and the Lord's Prayer' Michael Brown has called attention to the theological implications of daily petition. He argues that the instruction to repeatedly ask God for the same thing stands in sharp contradistinction to the Greek concept of prayer. In the Platonic conceptualization, God stood as immutable, impassible, and therefore *perfect*. If God could be changed, if God could alter his course of action, if God could be swayed by any human activity (including prayer) — then by implication, God could not be *perfect*. Perfection requires absolute constancy. Thus, *Plato* characterized the provision of humanity's need as an indication of God's

[135] Some late manuscripts contain a variant reading of this petition, wherein 'let your kingdom come' was replaced with 'let your Holy Spirit come upon us and cleanse us.' See Metzger (2002), 130-131. Although poorly attested, one can easily see how later disciples of the *Lukan school* could have expressed their longing for the kingdom in this fashion. Harnack, Leaney and Ott are among the scholars who have argued for the authenticity of this reading, although the majority characterize it as later liturgical modification. For a survey of the opinions, see Carruth & Garsky (1996), 4-18.

[136] Lk 11:2.

[137] Meier (2001), 355n, notes that Luke has similarly changed the instruction on carrying the cross from 'today' (Mark 8:34 Matt 16:24) to 'everyday' in Lk 9:23.

[138] As noted previously, I reject the notion that the aorist tense of the verbs in the first three petitions creates an eschatological orientation for the LP in Matthew and the *Didache*.

omnibenevolence. His goodness can be compared to that of the Sun, which blesses all the earth, and yet remains unaffected by the benevolence that it bestows.

In contrast to the Platonic paradigm, Luke envisions petition and provision as an expression of relationship: 'What father among you, if his son asks for a fish, will instead of a fish give him a serpent; or if he asks for an egg, will give him a scorpion?' (Lk 11:11-12) In Luke's conceptualization, the Father takes pleasure in providing for the needs of His children, and desires them to make their needs known to Him.[139] Petition, is not a formulaic requirement, so-to-speak, but rather an expression of relational dependence. The very notion that Christians are instructed to pray implies that God *can in fact* be swayed to intervene in human affairs. More is asked from the believer than a fatalistic dependence upon God's foreordained benevolence. The implications of these notions within the LP are expressed forcefully by Brown:

> The Lord's Prayer envisages a God whose activity is not unilateral but relational. The activity of God through natural forces provides for the possibility of obtaining bread. This activity is a product of divine omnibenevolence. However, the attainment of bread is dependent upon more than just this initial divine activity. God must also be 'reminded' to influence the activity of the human beings involved in the production and distribution of bread, including the human being making the request, so that the process can reach its desired conclusion. And since human beings are subject to uncooperativeness, the daily renewal of this petition attests to the need for the ongoing activity of God. In short, the petition for bread is not a request for the unilateral, coercive intrusion of God in the present (e.g., God giving bread directly to the orant) but rather is a request for the relational, persuasive, and continual activity of God in the present, with anticipatory feelings about the future.[140]

The manner by which Luke envisions the provision of bread is amply illustrated in the narrative. First, Luke validates the Greek concept of God's overarching provision for the material needs of humanity. Paul tells his Athenian audience that it is God who 'gives to all mankind life and breath and everything.'(Acts 17:25) Second, Luke presents the possibility of miraculous provision, as manifest in the feeding of the five

[139] See Lk 11:9-10.

[140] Brown (2000), 610.

thousand.[141] But the most predominant means of God's provision in Luke-Acts is that which takes place through the generosity of believers, one toward another. As Brown has suggested above, God's provision of bread takes the form of His relational, persuasive activity within the human heart.

On this particular topic, we find once again a prescription in the Gospel, which is subsequently realized in the life of the church of throughout the book of Acts. At the core of Luke's vision is his predisposition for the poor. Harkening back to the *Magnificat*, we recall Mary's proclamation that God exalts the humble and fills the hungry with good things, while He sends away the rich empty-handed.[142] We recall Jesus' programmatic agenda to proclaim good news to the poor, liberty to the captives, recovery of sight to the blind, and liberty those who are oppressed.[143] The proclamation of good news to the poor is the validation of Jesus' messianic ministry.[144] The poor are blessed;[145] the poor are loved by God;[146] and the poor are commended for their righteousness.[147] It thus comes as no surprise that the deep concern and compassion for the poor which is evinced by Jesus in the Gospel, finds expression in the life of the early church. Christians in the book of Acts are characterized by their sacrificial generosity toward one another. They share their food and wealth to such an extent that no one had need among them.[148]

In summary, we find in the Lukan petition, 'give us each day our daily bread' a strong emphasis on the relational dimensions of the Christian faith, both *vertical* and *horizontal*. First, Luke's emphasis on the need to daily renew one's request for bread reminds his readers that they must continually invite, and seek out God's involvement in their affairs. The problem is not God's reluctance to help,[149] for God is disposed, as a loving father, to provide for the needs of His children.[150] Persistence in prayer, as demonstrated in the daily request for bread, is an expression of relational

[141] Lk 9:12-27.

[142] Lk 1:52-53.

[143] Lk 4:18.

[144] Lk 7:22.

[145] Lk 6:20.

[146] Lk 16:22.

[147] Lk 21:2-3.

[148] Act 2:43-47; 4:34-35.

[149] Lk 11:5-8; 18: 1-7.

[150] Lk 11:9-13.

dependence on Him, and a recognition that there are forces opposed to the accomplishment of His will. The second relational dimension of this petition, the *horizontal* element, concerns the disposition of the believer to become the answer to her own prayer. Luke has demonstrated that God is emotionally engaged with the plight of the poor. Thus it follows that those who have encountered Him in relationship must ultimately extend that same compassion and benevolence toward others.

F. Forgiveness

The Lukan version of the LP includes the petition, 'and forgive us our sins,' which is followed by the protatic clause, 'for we ourselves forgive everyone who is indebted to us.'[151] The forgiveness of sins is a special concern for Luke, and once again his strategy is to 'flesh it out' in a manner with which his readers can relate. Luke's particular characterization of God's disposition to forgive is evident in certain stories that are found exclusively in his Gospel: the woman who anoints Jesus' feet in the house of Simon the Pharisee;[152] the story of Zacchaeus;[153] and the parable of the prodigal son.[154] In these three accounts, Luke seeks to draw out the emotive aspects of forgiveness. There is a sensuousness in the image of the woman who anoints Jesus' feet with her tears and oil, and dries them with her hair; a brotherly tenderness which Jesus expresses toward Zaccheus, the 'son of Abraham' in whose home he will eat a meal; and an obvious joy experienced by the father who receives back a son he had once counted as dead. Luke's accounts emphasize the aesthetic qualities of forgiveness, the *feelings* which God experiences as He is reconciled with those whom He loves. And Luke's portrayals of inter-personal forgiveness are no less compelling: Jesus pleads for the

[151] καὶ ἄφες ἡμῖν τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν, καὶ γὰρ αὐτοὶ ἀφίομεν παντὶ ὀφείλοντι ἡμῖν (Lk 11:4). There are slight variations between these clauses as they appear in Luke, over against their presentation in Matthew and the *Didache*. These differences reflect the style more than the theology of the respective authors. Luke's characterization of sin as ἁμαρτία would have been familiar to a Greek-speaking audience, as opposed the aramism ὀφείλημα (debts) found in the texts of the *Didache* and Matthew. However, Luke uses the debt metaphor in the protasis, in the participle form παντὶ ὀφείλοντι ἡμῖν ('all those owing us'). It is also noteworthy that in Luke, ἀφίημι (to forgive) alternates between the aorist tense καὶ ἄφες ἡμῖν τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν, and the present tense καὶ γὰρ αὐτοὶ ἀφίομεν παντὶ ὀφείλοντι ἡμῖν, lending weight to the notion that within the LP, these tenses are stylistically interchangeable.

[152] Lk 7:36-50.

[153] Lk 19:1-10.

[154] Lk 15:11-32.

Father to forgive those who have crucified him, even as they callously cast lots for his clothing;[155] amidst a shower of stones pelting his body, Stephen falls to his knees and with his last breath implores, 'Lord, do not hold this sin against them.' (Acts 7:60) Luke's narrative stimulates the emotional engagement of his readers as they ponder the meaning of forgiveness in their own lives.

Another important aspect of forgiveness in the Lukan framework is the necessity of repentance. Luke was keen to emphasize that true remorse over sin must be accompanied by acts of repentance. It is only in the Lukan account of John's preaching that the 'fruits of repentance' are enumerated.[156] Jesus proclaimed that salvation had come to the house of Zaccheus only after he committed to share his wealth with the poor and restore those whom he had defrauded.[157] All throughout Luke-Acts, repentance and forgiveness are presented in formulaic correlation.[158] In Luke's view, they are dependent upon one another.

In summary, we may say that Luke views forgiveness as a means of preserving relationships. He emphasizes the emotional dynamics of reconciliation: tenderness, intimacy, and broken-ness over separation. He thus provides a 'heart motivation' for his readers to seek forgiveness from God, and to extend it toward one another. Luke also maintains his insistence that the inclinations of a man's heart must be manifest in his deeds. Thus, even as the church prays, 'forgive us our sins' there is a concomitant resolution that they will change their ways and do what is right.

G. *Temptation*

The LP in Luke concludes with the petition, 'and lead us not into temptation.'[159] In Luke's view, 'falling into temptation' is to be associated with giving up, falling away, or denying Christ. His remedy is seen clearly in Lk 18:1, where he encourages his readers to 'always to pray and not lose heart.' Prayer and vigilance are Luke's prescription for the strength to stand firm in the face of adversity and unfulfilled hopes.[160] His concern for persevering prayer is thematically undergirded by his

[155] Lk 23:34.

[156] Lk 3:11-14. Compare Mt 3:7-12.

[157] Lk 19:8-9.

[158] Lk 3:3; 17:3-4; 24:47; Act 2:38; 5:31; 8:22.

[159] καὶ μὴ εἰσενέγκῃς ἡμᾶς εἰς πειρασμόν (Lk 11:4).

[160] The initial champion of this view was Wilhelm Ott [cited by Holmas (2011), 4] who suggested that the *Sitz im Leben* of Luke's Gospel was the delay of the Parousia.

metaphorical use of *sleep* and *alertness*. *Sleep* represents spiritual dullness or weakness of heart. The disciples fell asleep when their sorrow overcame them.[161] Sleep had hindered them from seeing the transfigured Christ, but 'when they became fully awake they saw his glory.' (Lk 9:32) *Alertness* symbolizes perseverance and attentiveness, as seen in the parable of the master who finds his servants awake when he returns.[162]

We discover once again, in various passages, Luke's proclivity to undergird the petitions of the LP in the teachings of Jesus, and to depict their application in the lives of his characters.[163] Jesus specifically instructs his disciples, 'But stay awake at all times, praying that you may have strength to escape all these things that are going to take place.'(Lk 21:36) And when they struggle to do so, he asks, 'Why are you sleeping? Rise and pray that you may not enter into temptation.'(Lk 22:40, 46) Jesus prays that the strength of his disciples would not fail.[164] He demonstrates persevering prayer in his own life. His victories over Satan and in trial are directly tied to his constancy in prayer.[165] On the negative side, Jesus speaks of those who have no root — who believe for a while, 'and in time of testing (πειρασμός) fall away.' (Lk 8:13)[166] In the accounts of Ananias and Sapphira,[167] and Simon,[168] Luke's readers see what such apostasy looks like.

Luke wrote with the awareness that many people among his own readers were facing adversity and were at the point of losing heart.[169]

Amidst discouragement, ongoing trials and anxieties, prayer was required for perseverance.

161 See Lk 22:45.

162 See Lk 12:37.

163 Overall, Luke displays a special concern for the theme of temptation, as he uses πειρασμός with much greater frequency than the other Gospel authors. All three synoptics include the term in their Gethsemane accounts 'pray that you may not enter into temptation,' (Mt 26:41; Mk 14:38 and Lk 22:40). However, it does not appear elsewhere in Mark; and in Matthew the only other occurrence is in the LP (Mt 6:13). In appears a total of six times in Luke (Lk 4:13; 8:13; 11:4; 22:28, 40, 46), and once in Act 20:19.

164 Lk 22:32.

165 Lk 4:1-14; 22:44.

166 Only Luke uses πειρασμός in this parable, as compared to Mt 13:21 where we find θλίψεως ἢ διωγμοῦ ('tribulation and persecution').

167 Act 5:1-10.

168 Act 8:13; 18-24.

169 This explains the editorial comment in Lk 18:1. My inclination is to not attribute Luke's concern for perseverance exclusively to the delay of the Parousia. Persecu-

They were struggling with temptation. Consequently, 'lead us not into temptation' is a call to alertness and prayer for perseverance. Within the context of Luke's Gospel, it reminds his readers that temptations will come, and they that must be ready.[170] It recognizes the need for God to intervene on behalf of those who desire to remain faithful and obedient.

IV. A Shorter Form of the Lord's Prayer

A. Exploring Luke's Rationale

Having now reviewed the various petitions which form part of the Lukan LP, we turn our attention to those aspects which are perhaps, *missing*. Given the brevity of the LP in its various forms, the differences between the Lukan form and the other ancient texts (i.e. Matthew and the *Didache*) are quite striking. We note that first, there are stylistic differences. For example, Luke gives preference to the present tense over the aorist, and uses the Greek term for sin (ἁμαρτία) rather than the aramism ὀφείλημα (debt). But more notable are several elements of the prayer that are not included in Luke's version. Luke's prayer is addressed simply to 'Father' and not 'Our Father in Heaven.' He excludes the petition 'let your will be done,' and the phrase, 'on earth as it is in heaven.' And Luke's version does not include the petition, 'deliver us from evil.'

Although these discrepancies have been the subject of considerable analysis, there is no conclusive explanation as to why the Lukan form is shorter. The majority of modern scholars are inclined to argue that the Lukan five-petition form is closer to the original prayer as taught by Jesus. The rationale behind this view is summarized by Jeremias:

> The shorter form of Luke is completely contained in the longer form of Matthew. This makes it very probable that the Matthean form is an expanded one, for according to all that we know about the tendency of liturgical texts to conform to certain laws in their transmission, in a case where the shorter version is contained in the longer one, the shorter text is to be regarded as original. No one would have dared to shorten a

tion, adversity and despair have always formed part of the Christian experience, with or without the expectation of an imminent Second Coming.

[170] Kistemaker (1978), 326, points to the parallels between this petition and the words of Sirach: '"My son, if you come forward to serve the Lord, prepare yourself for temptation"(Sir 2:1). "No evil will befall the man who fears the Lord, but in trial (*peirasmos*) he will deliver him again and again"(33:1).'

> sacred text like the Lord's Prayer and to leave out two petitions if they had formed part of the original tradition. On the contrary, the reverse is amply attested, that in the early period, before wordings were fixed, liturgical texts were elaborated, expanded, and enriched.[171]

Although there is a high degree of rationality to Jeremias' argument, there are in fact no 'laws' governing the transmission of liturgical texts. Against Jeremias (and the consensus), my contention is that the seven-petition forms found in Matthew and the *Didache* are more ancient, and that Luke reduced the longer form that was prevalent at the time of his writing.[172]

In consideration of this possibility, the first question that must be addressed is: *Would* Luke shorten the prayer? It is implied in Jeremias' comments that a certain amount of audacity would have been required to commit such an act. We must bear in mind, however, that nowhere in his narrative does Luke demonstrate a deep concern for recording the full text of prayers. As Holmas has commented, 'Only sporadically does he record a prayer's content. Luke's penchant for very brief notes clearly lends emphasis 'upon the settings for prayer rather than the substance of

[171] Cited by Carruth & Garsky, (1996), 76.

[172] A few comments are in order. First, there is no question in my mind that Luke was familiar with the longer form of the LP. Given the rapid and broad dissemination of the gospel tradition [see Thompson (1998)] and the centrality of the LP within that tradition, it is highly unlikely that Luke would have been unfamiliar with the seven-petition form. Second, now that the literary independence of the *Didache* has clearly been proven, we accept that there were two independent traditions of the seven-petition form. This lends weight to the argument that the longer form is more ancient. Finally, I wish to clarify that the present exercise is, in my mind, unrelated to the effort to reconstruct the 'Q' form of the LP. My sympathies generally lie with Betz (1985), 66, who questions the possibility of ever finding an 'original form' of the LP. My position is summarized by the following points:

1. Jesus taught the disciples a prayer which is a prototype of that which is found in our early sources.
2. Jesus and the disciples implemented the prayer into their daily ritual.
3. Given the Jewish aversion to fixed forms, it is unlikely that they would have prayed the prayer in exactly the same way each time.
4. The prayer was most likely transmitted by the disciples in different forms — all of which had a common structure and themes, but with slight variations in the wording.
5. In the absence of an 'officially sanctioned form,' Matthew, the framers of the *Didache,* and Luke each took liberties to adapt the basic prayer according to their purposes. This is what accounts for the slight variations in grammar and word choice.
6. As the LP was translated into Greek (and Latin), a balanced phraseology became important.

prayers, contexts more than contents."[173] When Luke does offer the text of various prayers, they are often limited to the 'gist' of their content.[174] He includes only that material which he considers germane to his objectives.

The second question is: *Why* would Luke shorten the prayer? On the one hand, we note the possibility that Luke may have shortened the prayer simply to give it a more ancient appearance.[175] However, there are indications within Luke-Acts that point to an even more sophisticated motive. There is strong evidence in the text that one petition in particular, 'let your will be done,' was deliberately removed from a longer form of the LP.[176] There is a *probable cause* for the removal of this line, and it stands in regard to Luke's Gentile readership. Seeking to keep the understanding of this prayer within carefully controlled boundaries, he excised any element of the longer form in which he saw the potential for confusion or misinterpretation. *The will of God* was a concept that Luke treated very cautiously, as he was keenly aware of how his newly converted Gentile readers could misunderstand its meaning. Many streams of Greco-Roman religious thought had a strong inclination toward predeterminism and fatalism.[177] These concepts could often be confused with the *will of God*. Rather than focusing on an abstract notion that could potentially be misunderstood — Luke's strategy was simply to demonstrate how his Gentile readers could put into practice the ways of the Father as revealed through the teachings of Jesus. He wanted to leave no room for confusion.

The pivotal point (in what I am here presenting as Luke's rationale) is the element of fatalism in various expressions of Greco-Roman thought. Whereas our present purpose does not allow for a thorough investigation, it will be beneficial to briefly consider some of the cultural dynam-

[173] Holmas (2011), 59.

[174] e.g., Lk 22:41-42; Act 1:24-25; Act 4:24-30.

[175] Thomas O'Loughlin of the University of Nottingham has suggested to me that Luke may have 'reverse-engineered' the longer form in order to give it the appearance of a more ancient prayer. Given Luke's concerns for origins, his primary intention may have been to relate how the LP was originally taught by Jesus.

[176] I am limiting my analysis to the single clause concerning *the will of God*. It is probable that Luke also trimmed the petition 'deliver us from evil.' However, I have not found sufficient indications within Luke-Acts to suggest his rationale.

[177] Zagzebski (Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy) defines fatalism as, 'the thesis that human acts occur by necessity and hence are unfree.' She goes on to say: 'Theological fatalism is the thesis that infallible foreknowledge of a human act makes the act necessary and hence unfree.'

ics that surrounded Luke's works. First, we shall look at streams of fatalism in Greco-Roman thought. Second, we will consider the attention that Luke's successors in the second century gave to this issue. Finally, upon that backdrop, we will consider how cultural conceptualizations of fatalism stood at odds with Luke's objectives in his presentation of the LP.

B. Fate in Greco-Roman Thought

The interplay of fate and free will was a complex matter among the Greco-Roman thinkers of classical antiquity. Stoicism's emphasis on the absolute triumph of the Divine will,[178] and the Platonic notion of Divine immutability[179] both may have been problematic in Luke's view. That is, each system of thought had the potential to cast a cloud upon what he was presenting the as the necessity of prayer for the fulfillment of God's will.[180]

What may have constituted the biggest threat to Luke's objectives — and where we see the clearest example of fatalism — was the cultural preponderance of astrology. The basic tenets of this belief system were enumerated in first-century didactic poem of Manilius entitled *Astronomica*.[181] Utilizing the terminology of Stoic philosophy, Manilius identifies the heavens with what he interchangeably refers to as *god* or *reason.* He asserts that the stars are the medium through which the divinity controls all that happens on earth:

[178] For example, the Stoic philosopher Chrysippus was quoted by Aulus Gellius [see Inwood and Gerson, (2008), 109] as saying: 'Fate is a sempiternal and unchangeable series and chain of things, rolling and unraveling itself through eternal sequences of cause and effect, of which it is composed and compounded ... by fate all things are forced and linked by a necessary and dominant reason.'

Inwood and Gerson (2008) xiv, note that, 'In keeping with their intense interest in causation, the Stoics embraced determinism along with their providential teleology.'

[179] The conceptualization of God presented in *The Republic* emphasizes the notion of His absolute immutability (see pps. 115-117). Plato argues that 'it is impossible that God should ever be willing to change; being, as it is supposed, the fairest and the best that is conceivable, every God remains absolutely and for ever in his own form.' (117)

[180] My argument in this chapter has been that Luke believed in the power of prayer to move the hand of God. If God's will always prevails, as the Stoics seemed to say, then prayer plays no role in the success of His purposes. If God is immutable, as Plato argued, then there can be no element of persuasion in prayer. The parables of Lk 11:5-13 and Lk 18:1-8 seem to suggest that Luke thought otherwise.

[181] Pliny named Manilius as 'the founder of astrology at Rome.' [Barton (1994), 34]

> This god and all-controlling reason, then, derives earthly beings from the heavenly signs; though the stars are remote at a far distance, he compels recognition of their influences, in that they give to the peoples of the world their lives and destinies and to each man his own character. (*Astronomica* 2: 82-86)[182]

The extent to which the stars determine the course of events in man's life is absolute:

> Every sort of fact, every effort, every achievement, every skill and every vicissitude that through all the phases of human life may concern human fate; and it has disposed these in as many varied ways as there are positions of the stars; has attributed to each object definite functions and appropriate names, and through the stars, by a fixed system, has ordained a complete census of the human race. (*Astronomica* 3:67-73)[183]

The predominance of astrology is well documented, particularly among the Roman ruling class, but its influence was by no means limited to the elite.[184] Astrological fatalism was the fundamental tenet of Roman creed in the first century CE, as the observations of Tacitus testify: 'Most men, however, find it natural to believe that their lives are predestined from birth, that the science of prophecy is verified by remarkable testimonials, ancient and modern; and that unfulfilled predictions are due merely to ignorant impostors who discredit it.'[185]

C. *Christian Response*

In the first century CE, Christian self identification vis-à-vis Greco-Roman religion and philosophy had yet to take full form. Luke was not a full-fledged 'apologist' – yet he did set the trajectory for his successors. In his effort to make the gospel intelligible and coherent to a Greek au-

[182] Cited by Volk, (2004), 35.

[183] Cited by Barton (1994), 162.

[184] Barton (1994), 39-40 notes that astrologically based prophesies were recorded for all of the emperors; Augustus put Capricorn on his coins; and images of Capricorn have been found from the era of Augustus on sculptural reliefs, terracottas, paintings and jewelry. Noting the broad influence of astrologers within Roman society, Barton (1994), 50, also notes that, 'Between the death of Julius Caesar and that of Marcus Aurelius in 180 CE, no fewer than eight, and possibly as many as thirteen, decrees expelling astrologers and other groups from Rome and Italy are recorded.'

[185] *Annals* 6.22. Cited by Barton (1994), 53.

dience, he laid the groundwork for what would later become the full-scale engagement with Greco-Roman thought.

One characteristic of the second-century apologists was their preoccupation with the notions of free-will and fatalism. Justin Martyr (100-165), for example, argued that the fulfillment of prophecy does not signify that all human activity is driven by fate:[186] Clement of Alexandria (155-220 CE) was an ardent opponent of astrology and a champion of free-will.[187] And Tatian (d 180 CE), a student of Justin, also made strong arguments in favor of human free will.[188]

While the declarations of these later apologists cannot *prove* anything about Luke, they do give us a clear indication of the directionality that he established on the matter of fate. Justin, Clement, and Tatian stood in continuity with Luke, as they all sought to engage similar au-

[186] I *Apologia* 43: 'But lest some suppose, from what has been said by us, that we say that whatever happens, happens by a fatal necessity, because it is foretold as known beforehand, this too we explain. We have learned from the prophets, and we hold it to be true, that punishments, and chastisements, and good rewards, are rendered according to the merit of each man's actions. Since if it be not so, but all things happen by fate, neither is anything at all in our own power. For if it be fated that this man, e.g., be good, and this other evil, neither is the former meritorious nor the latter to be blamed. And again, unless the human race have the power of avoiding evil and choosing good by free choice, they are not accountable for their actions, of whatever kind they be.' See also 2 *Apologia* 7, where he specifically addresses the Stoic notions of fate and necessity.

[187] With regard to astrology, see *Protrepticus* 6. On the matter of free will, he wrote He wrote, 'Each one of us, who sins, with his own free-will chooses punishment, and the blame lies with him who chooses. God is without blame.' (*Paedagogus* 1.8)

[188] With regard to free will, he states in *Oratio AD Graecos* 7: 'Each of the two classes of created things (men and angels) is born with a power of self-determination, not absolutely good by nature, for that is an attribute of God alone, but brought to perfection through freedom of voluntary choice, in order that the bad man may be justly punished, being himself the cause of his being wicked, and that the righteous man may be worthily praised for his good actions, not having in his exercise of moral freedom transgressed the will of God.' He addresses the practice of Astrology in *Oratio AD Graecos* 9: 'Such are the demons; these are they who laid down the doctrine of Fate. Their fundamental principle was the placing of animals in the heavens... Thus the high-spirited and he who is crushed with toil, the temperate and the intemperate, the indigent and the wealthy, are what they are simply from the controllers of their nativity. For the delineation of the zodiacal circle is the work of gods. And, when the light of one of them predominates, as they express it, it deprives all the rest of their honour; and he who now is conquered, at another time gains the predominance. And the seven planets are well pleased with them, as if they were amusing themselves with dice. But we are superior to Fate, and instead of wandering (πλανητῶν) demons, we have learned to know one Lord who wanders not; and, as we do not follow the guidance of Fate, we reject its lawgivers.'

diences.[189] As we now look specifically at Luke's perspective on fatalism, it becomes increasingly clear that the apologists had only echoed what they had received from him.

D. *Fatalism and Prayer in Luke-Acts*

Ironically, Luke has often been often been characterized as being in sympathy with certain aspects of pre-determinism.[190] When interpreted within a framework of divine determinism, however, the Lukan conceptualization of prayer is rendered incoherent. In our above treatment of Luke's theology of prayer, we analyzed his presentation of God's purpose in history (ἡ βουλῇ τοῦ θεοῦ), the independence of the human will, predestination, the work of Satan, and human opposition to God's purposes. We found that Luke's theology of prayer has been summarized by the notion that: ***Initiative belongs to God, but human collaboration through prayer is necessary in order for God's purposes to be accomplished***. It is for this reason that Luke took great pains to characterize his protagonists as people of prayer; that he laid out his theological paradigm on prayer; that he demonstrated the power of prayer at key turning points in the story; and that he gave so much attention to Jesus' teaching on prayer. If Luke truly believed that the accomplishment of the divine plan was a foregone conclusion, and completely immune to human activity or influence, then it becomes rather difficult to explain his obsessive insistence on the need for prayer.

Another factor that we have mentioned which militates against any suggestion of fatalism in Luke-Acts, is his exhortation to *persist* in prayer. The notion of a God who would make His followers grovel for that which has already been determined by divine fate is strangely at odds with Luke's characterization of the Father's generous disposition. Luke presents persistence as a necessity because God's good purposes

[189] It is implausible that all of these apologists would have sharply broken from the Evangelist on this topic. Luke must be explicable in the light of the apologists, and the apologists must be explicable in the light of Luke.

[190] We have cited Crump (1992), who sought to interpret Luke within the framework of Reformed theology. Schulz argued that pagan ideas of inevitable fate influenced Luke's theology, and that Luke believed in the predetermined character of history wherein everything is predestined to reach its appointed end, and human sin and opposition cannot impede what God has ordained. [cited by Marshall (1970), 79-80] Catchpole argued against the notion that Luke would remove 'your will be done' noting: 'It is not a matter of "dropping this hint of fatalism" and even if it were it would be curious that an evangelist with so strong a sense of the divine should find such a hint unattractive.' [cited by Carruth & Garsky (1996), 107]

are at times resisted. It is because men choose to oppose His ways, and because there is opposition in the spiritual realm, that the disciples must continually ask God to intervene in the course of human affairs.

Finally, we recall Luke's emphasis on the emotional engagement of the Father with His children. As we have seen in his stories on forgiveness, Luke emphasizes the affective character of God. There is a sense of tender intimacy with the repentant woman, and the emotions of surprise and joy as the father receives back his errant son. In a fatalistic, Platonic conceptualization of God — there can be no true divine emotion. Sadness, joy, surprise, tenderness and anger are all characteristics of dynamic and free relationships. If all things are pre-determined by God, then any hint of God's emotional life is not authentic, and can only be labeled as a mere anthropomorphism.

E. Your Will be Done

What may have been the 'rub' for Luke with regard to the petition 'your will be done,' is that within a fatalistic worldview, the accomplishment of the divine will is a foregone conclusion. There is no basis for *asking* God to accomplish His will. All there can be is the simple recognition that His will *is going to be done*. This was a misinterpretation that Luke sought to avoid. Cognizant of the potential confusion that the notion of *God's will* might cause, Luke chose to exclude this expression from his presentation of the prayer.

There are three passages in Luke's Gospel that, by way of synoptic comparison, betray his inclination to reconfigure for his audience the idea of *God's will*. We note the differences in the following texts (emphases mine):[191]

> Mt 7:21: 'Not everyone who says to me, "Lord, Lord," will enter the kingdom of heaven, *but the one who does the will of my Father who is in heaven*.'
> Lk 6:46-47: 'Why do you call me "Lord, Lord," *and not do what I tell you? Everyone who comes to me and hears my words and does them*, I will show you what he is like...'

> Mk 3:34-35: 'Here are my mother and my brothers! For *whoever does the will of God*, he is my brother and sister and mother.'

[191] These textual comparisons are from Carruth & Garsky (1996), 109, who cite Feldkamper.

> Mt 12:49-50: 'Here are my mother and my brothers! For ***whoever does the will of my Father*** in heaven is my brother and sister and mother.'
> Lk 8:21: 'My mother and my brothers are those ***who hear the word of God and do it***.'

> Mt 18:13-14: 'And if he finds it, truly, I say to you, he rejoices over it more than over the ninety-nine that never went astray. ***So it is not the will of my Father who is in heaven*** that one of these little ones should perish.'
> Lk 15:5-7: 'And when he has found it, he lays it on his shoulders, rejoicing... Just so, I tell you, there will be more joy in heaven over ***one sinner who repents*** than over ninety-nine righteous persons who need no repentance.'

What is clearly seen in these passages is that Luke deliberately edited his sources to replace terminology concerning the *will of God* with expressions emphasizing obedience and repentance.[192] D*oing the will of God* has become *hearing my words and doing them*. The Father rejoices not because *His will is done*, but rather because a *sinner has come to repentance*. Hence, Luke replaces the abstract notion of *God's will* with these concrete notions that can in no way be subject to misunderstanding and misinterpretation in the eyes of his Gentile readers.

This is not to say, however, that Luke altogether avoids reference to the divine will (θέλημα).[193] He is, in fact, willing to use this term in controlled circumstances. We find reference to *the will* (θέλημα) of God, but only when it can be explicitly linked to the pre-determined *purpose* (βουλῄ) of God for individual characters within the story. We note the following examples: It was the foreordained βουλῄ of God for Jesus to die,[194] and thus it was the specific θέλημα of the Father for him to submit himself to arrest and crucifixion;[195] God raised up David to serve

[192] One may attempt to make the opposite argument, i.e., that it was Matthew who modified Luke. This however, does not explain Lk 8:21 vis-à-vis Mark 3:34-35, nor does it account for Luke's form of the LP vis-à-vis the*Didache*'s 'let your will be done.' The evidence weighs in favor a Lukan modification.

[193] Explicit reference to the ***will of God*** appears only once in Luke's Gospel as Jesus prays, 'not my will, but yours, be done.'(Lk 22:42) It appears in Acts three times: 1) Paul cites God's characterization of David as a man 'who will do all my will' (Act 13:22); 2) When Paul's party could not persuade him against going to Jerusalem, they declared, 'Let the will of the Lord be done' (Act 21:14); and 3) Ananias prophesied to Paul that, 'The God of our fathers appointed you to know his will.'(Act 22:14)

[194] Act 2:23.

[195] Lk 22:42.

His βουλῇ,[196] and therefore it was His explicit θέλημα that he become king;[197] God declared His overarching purpose for Paul's life,[198] and subsequently, the specific path to the fulfillment of this purpose was revealed as God's θέλημα for him.[199]

We see that Luke is willing to refer to the divine θέλημα in controlled contexts. These are situations in which God has already declared what He intends to do, and consequently there are specific events in the lives of Luke's characters that must take place in order for the βουλῇ of God to be accomplished.[200] That is as far as Luke will go, however, with regard to pre-destination. What he will not allow is an overarching pre-determination of all human events and activities.[201] He sought to carefully guard the freedom of the human will, and was thus unwilling to make reference to the divine θέλημα in any way that his Gentile readers might associate with the fatalistic worldview from which they were emerging.

F. *Concluding Remarks on the Shorter Form*

In this section, our endeavor has been to explore possible explanations for the shorter form of the LP which Luke presents in his Gospel. It is my contention that Luke was familiar with the longer, seven-petition

[196] Act 13:36.

[197] Act 13:22.

[198] Act 9:15-16.

[199] Act 21:14; 22:14.

[200] The idea that certain things *must happen* is prevalent in Luke-Acts, as evident in his frequent use of δεῖ (to be necessary). Many events in the life of Jesus occur by necessity. For example: 'he must suffer many things' (Lk 9:22; 17:25; 24:26); he must go to Jerusalem (Lk 13:33); what was written about him must be fulfilled (Lk 22:37; 24:44); he must be crucified (Lk 24:7). This same sense of necessity continues to some extent in the lives of the apostles. For example: Paul must suffer (Act 9:16); and Paul must testify in Rome (Act 23:11; 27:24). In all of these instances, the basic notion is that certain things must occur in order for God's foreordained plan of salvation to be successful. That plan is summarized in Lk 24:46-47: Jesus must die, He must rise again, and the gospel must be preached. Luke presents God as intervening among human affairs in order to make salvation possible. However, he does not present God as controlling or pre-determining all human activity.

[201] For a thorough discussion on foreordination in Luke, see Marshall (1970), 104-107. He argues that Luke's concept is to be interpreted within the framework of OT thought: 'What is more typical of Luke is his emphasis on the way in which events unfold at the behest of God and in accordance with his plan. This interpretation of history is of course familiar from the Old Testament where past history is regarded as expressing the purpose of God, and future history is the object of prophecy by men with an insight into the intentions of God.' (105)

version of the LP that was in common use as he wrote. Out of particular consideration for his Gentile readership, however, he simplified the prayer in his text. The evidence for this editorial reduction of the LP is particularly strong with regard to the petition, 'let your will be done.'

The *will of God* was a term that could potentially be confused with Greco-Roman concepts of fatalism. Operating within the same theological stream as the second-century apologists, Luke was a strong advocate of human free-will. In his view, any hint of fatalism threatened one of the primary objectives of his narrative, which was to spur Christians to action. The notion of *God's will* was not a topic that he altogether avoided. In carefully controlled contexts, he was willing to employ the notion of the divine θέλημα. In other situations, however, he preferred to edit material from his sources, particularly where he saw a potential for misunderstanding. In such instances, he replaced the notion of *God's will* with the performance of righteous deeds.

Luke's conceptualization of the *will of God* was one rooted in action above abstract theology. He had sufficient confidence that the fullness of the LP's purpose could be conveyed without this petition. He was, at heart, a pragmatist. If this petition, or any other, was (in his view) superfluous, then he did not hesitate to exclude them from the prayer.

V. Conclusion

Luke envisioned a Spirit-empowered church having a mission to advance the faith to the 'ends of the earth.' Essential to this growth would be prayer. Just as God's purposes in the History of Salvation had previously advanced behind the impetus of prayer, so the completion of the missionary task would be driven by this same endeavor. In Luke's eyes, the LP encapsulated all that which was necessary for success. It would foster the relationship with the Father that would enable the church to operate in the power of the Spirit. It would nurture the unity and internal health of the Christian communities. And it would call the people to a faith expressed in both word and deed. Luke's understanding of the LP is summarized by the simple exhortation to *pray and do*. *Pray*, because that is what moves the hand of God. *Do* what the prayer envisions, because God works first and foremost through His own people.

Writing for a predominantly Gentile readership, Luke was aware that every word of the LP would potentially be interpreted in the light of the Greco-Roman worldview. Chief among his concerns was their

cultural inclination toward fatalism. Luke feared that resignation to *a pre-determined divine plan* might lead to a slackening in the church's missionary efforts. In the face of persecution and trial, Christians may lose heart if they allowed themselves to believe that God's purposes would be accomplished independently of their own proclamation and prayer. Consequently, through a multi-faceted strategy, Luke urged his readers to pray. And he presented the LP in such a way that demonstrated its applicability in everyday life. It was to be a prayer that was practiced as much as it was prayed.

Within the *Wirkungsgeschichte* of the LP, Luke's presentation represents a fascinating development on many fronts. First, his is the most vision-driven interpretation that we have yet encountered. Jesus, Matthew and the *Didache* strove to portray a prayer that stood in fundamental continuity with the narrative history and theology of Israel. Luke's interpretation of this prayer, however, did not endeavor to build bridges to the past. To be sure, he wanted his readers to understand the role of prayer in the development of the *Heilsgeschichte,* but he utilized history primarily as a motivational tool for the present. In the eyes of Luke, the LP was above all else the prayer of a forward-looking, mission-driven church.

Second, with regard to Luke's transmission of the LP, we note his willingness to adapt its form according to his purposes. His concern was not so much with the *ipissima vox Jesu* as it was with the specific objective that he wanted to accomplish among his audience. He rendered the LP in the form of a 'dynamic equivalent.' It was faithful to the teachings of Jesus, robust in its message, and concise in its wording — but its emphasis was on *function* above *form.* The expansion of the Christian faith among the Gentiles was a paramount concern to Luke, and that was the driving force behind his presentation of the LP.

Finally, Luke's treatment of the LP provides us insights into early-Christian strategies for the cross-cultural expansion of the faith. He demonstrated a keen understanding of the semiotic quality of language. He was aware that, set within new cultural contexts, the significance of expressions, metaphors and images could change. Therefore, he took great pains to control the significance of his words. Each petition of the LP was amplified and demonstrated in the lives of his characters and the development of his narrative. With little or no reference to other Christian texts, or the Old Testament, his readers could draw out the meaning of this prayer. In this way, the LP entered into a new level of accessibility and comprehension in a multitude of settings.

CHAPTER SIX: TERTULLIAN ON THE LORD'S PRAYER

I. Introduction

A. Tertullian and the Lord's Prayer

When Tertullian took up his pen in 200 CE to expound upon the Lord's Prayer, more than a hundred years had elapsed since any (known) author had treated the subject. During this time, the Christian movement and its leadership had gone through a dramatic transformation. Tertullian was not a Jew, nor had he been trained by Jews.[1] Although he knew Greek, he preferred to write in Latin. He was a Roman citizen living in the North African city of Carthage. His cultural milieu evinced a unique blend of Greco-Roman and North African sensibilities. Most notably, the Christian community to which Tertullian belonged was not a band of 'wandering charismatics,' nor a house gathering, nor a fledgling community of the socially marginalized. Christianity of the third century was an institution, with buildings and property, a hierarchical structure of leadership, recognized texts and an established dogma.[2]

It thus comes as no surprise that the *Wirkungsgeschichte* of the LP here takes a dramatic turn. Discontinuity now predominates. As expli-

[1] Cf. Decret (2009), 33.

[2] Of course we bear in mind that these characteristics were still in a primitive state as compared to later standards. This was the period of 'early Catholicism' which James Dunn (1990), 343, characterizes by 'stable patterns of organization geared to preserving the Church's identity with the past and its continuity into the future.' Among the features which Dunn (1990), 343-344, attributes to this era are the following: 1) Fading hope in an imminent Parousia; 2) Increasing institutionalization, as demonstrated in the creation of offices, hierarchy, and sacramentalism; and 3) The emergence of a 'rule of faith,' which served as a bulwark against false doctrine.

cated by Tertullian, the LP is un-tethered from its Jewish roots, from the history of Israel, and from the Jewish model of discipleship. Jesus is no longer the second Moses who goes back into the Wilderness to fulfill the Covenant. He is now the *Logos,* the articulation of wisdom. The narrative theology of Israel is now replaced with a philosophical theology governed by reason and ordering principles. For Tertullian, the LP is a 'new form' and a 'new prayer.' What it meant to Jews is now inconsequential.

Tertullian sought to present the LP as the rational articulation of the *Logos*. The Greeks had described the *Logos* as the operative force which held all things together and gave them shape, order, beauty and continuity. In the company of the early apologists, Tertullian thought of Jesus in these same terms: as the *reason* or *organizing principle* of the created world. Consequently, Tertullian's task in presenting the LP was to explain how this particular ritual is an operative instrument of God's *reason* (*dei ratio*). It was to him an innately rational prayer, with an immanently rational purpose: to make manifest the goodness of the Christian God.[3]

Tertullian's interpretation of the LP displays significant application of Stoic philosophy. His conceptualization of the *Logos*, his theological anthropology, and his notion of God's will and providence are all articulated in Stoic terms. We will thus discover in Tertullian a significant amount of innovation. This is not to say, however, that there is no continuity from Jesus. Tertullian's treatment of the LP demonstrates that meaning *can* cross the barriers of time, culture and language. In sum, his interpretation of the LP is an integration of Jewish, Roman and Hellenistic thought, which results in an articulation of this prayer that is native to none of these, but intelligible to all.

In this present chapter, our attention will focus primarily on those portions of *De oratione* that constitute his exegesis of the Lord's Prayer. Written right at the turn of the third century, this text is comprised of remarks which Tertullian prepared for the instruction of catechumens. As this constitutes a literary context for the LP that is completely distinct from what we have thus far seen, an adaptation of our methodology is in order. In previous chapters, we have taken a deductive approach toward discovering what the prayer meant to various authors. We ar-

[3] Cf. Simpson (1965), 117-120, who notes that 'the constitutive elements in prayer are equated with the total character of Jesus Christ,' (117) and that 'the distinctive note of Christian prayer is the conviction of the necessity to pray for specific *ta agatha* — the good things revealed by Jesus Christ in the Lord's Prayer.' (120)

rived at the interpretations of Jesus, Matthew, Luke and the *Didache* communities after *first* looking at the historical, literary and theological contexts in which they taught. *De oratione* is different however, in that it was written expressly as an interpretation and commentary on the prayer. Thus, our methodological approach will be more inductive. As we move through *De oratione* chapters 1-9 and 29, we will first summarize what Tertullian himself said about the LP. From there we will elucidate his thought and theology in the context of his other writings, and the thought world of third-century Carthage.

We begin with a brief glance at the author, and the historical context in which he wrote.

B. The Man and the Setting

At the end of the second century, as Quintus Septimus Florens Tertullianus began to write, barely two generations of Latin-speaking Christians had preceded him in North Africa. Often cited as the 'father of Western Theology,' Tertullian set the trajectory for various dimensions of Western Christian thought. His vocabulary alone made a significant contribution to Latin theology, as he introduced into our theological lexicon such terms as *trinitas, substantia, persona, sacramentum,* and *meritare.*[4] He was the first recorded expositor of the LP, and his commentary laid a foundation that would be built upon by such men as Cyprian (200-258), Augustine (354-430), and Theodore of Mopsuestia (350-427).[5]

Over the centuries, the traditional biographical sketch of Tertullian has been based upon a short account from Jerome (*c.* 345-*c.* 419).[6] While his account relates some information that is generally considered to be accurate, such as Tertullian's fame as an author and his positive influence on Cyprian, there are other elements of Jerome's account that have been called into question. These include his claim that Tertullian was a presbyter and that he fell into the heresy of Montanism. With regard to his status within the church, Tertullian was most likely not a member of the clergy, but rather a *senior.* To the extent that such offices can be determined, it appears that this was a leadership role particular to the church in North Africa. The responsibilities included administra-

[4] Ferguson (2009), 313.

[5] Simpson (1965) provides a detailed analysis of how Tertullian's interpretation of the LP is reflected in the way these later fathers understood the prayer.

[6] *De viris illustribus* 53.

tion of church affairs, the task of presiding over meetings, and (in the case of Tertullian) the training of catechumens.[7] With regard to his supposed lapse into heresy, the consensus of modern scholarship is that while his sympathy with the 'New Prophecy' of Montanism is certain, it is unlikely that he ever formally broke from the church.[8]

The erudition in Tertullian's writings betrays a high level of education, which may have included training in rhetoric, theoretical law (*Juris consultus*), as well as poetry, philosophy and history. His scholarly aptitude also implies that he proceeded from a family of respectable social and economic standing. Decret suggests that this dynamic may have had a bearing on the posture of his writings:

> Tertullian's close friendships with the powerful of his day — friendships probably established in school — later protected him in a very militant pagan context. This protection, perhaps offered without his knowledge or against his will, allowed him to flaunt a passionate commitment to Christ and to attack with a violent polemic those persecuting the church. Hence, he seemed to carry out his work without the fear of torment that had impacted so many others in the church.[9]

Never much of a conformist among his allies, nor a diplomat toward his adversaries, Tertullian's writings reflect the rigid sensibilities of Carthaginian Christianity. There existed in his day a fundamental incompatibility between the predominant ethos of Roman Africa and the ever expanding Christian movement. Carthage was a culturally and religiously diverse metropolis, in a flourishing region of the Empire.[10] Carthaginians had historically expressed a welcoming attitude toward immigrant religions. What they would not tolerate, however, was anything that they perceived as intolerance.[11] Consequently, the story of

[7] Cf. Stewart-Sykes (2004), 15-17; Decret (2009), 32.

[8] See Rankin (1995).

[9] Decret (2009), 33.

[10] Decret (2009), 5, notes that at its height (150-250 CE), Roman Africa had between four and seven million inhabitants, and nearly five hundred cities. Carthage, which competed with Alexandria for the title of the 'second' Roman city, had around 150,000 inhabitants.

[11] Decret (2009), 19, notes that 'Christianity had not come simply to revive the ancient cults; rather. It wanted to destroy all other worship forms and become the only religion ... This claim to one unique religion and a resulting uniformity in belief from East to West was not only insulting to pagans whose gods and long-standing worship would be reduced to the level of superstition, it also touched upon an inherent African aversion to particularism and to becoming aligned to any ideological system. Worse

Christianity in Carthage (and all of Roman Africa) is one of conflict, tension and persecution. As Tertullian wrote his *Apologeticus* (197), he claimed that Christians were being brought before the tribunal daily, tortured, exiled, decapitated, thrown to the lions in the amphitheater, burnt alive and crucified. In such circumstances, Tertullian saw room for neither compromise nor pusillanimity.

In this hostile environment, Christians naturally felt threatened. Brown notes that, 'The average African saw the world as a battlefield upon which she must be prepared to fight for survival.'[12] In this setting, the task of training catechumens was a rigorous process. According to Hippolytus (*c.* 160-236), candidates were first subject to a period of intensive screening. If they were deemed worthy, they would then enter into a time of instruction that would last up to three years. If it happened that they were apprehended for their faith prior to the completion of their training, theirs would be a 'baptism in their own blood.'[13] At the end of their instruction, they were subject to a final examination, probing whether 'they have lived soberly, whether they have honoured the widows, whether they have visited the sick, whether they have been active in well-doing.'[14] Once baptized, they were then allowed, for the first time, to recite the LP (and other prayers) in the company of the congregation.[15]

The LP was considered to be one of the secrets and mysteries of the church, and a great amount of caution was exercised with regard to participation in its recitation. One of Tertullian's primary critiques of the 'heretics' was their laxity in this regard:

> It is doubtful who is a catechumen, and who a believer; they have all access alike, they hear alike, they pray alike — even heathens, if any such

still, by planting itself in the midst of the masses, the new religion began to tear at the tightly woven African social fabric. As paganism penetrated every aspect of daily life, it was necessary for Christians, desiring to remain faithful to their convictions, to cut themselves off from their fellow citizens. They were essentially removed from family life and its traditional veneration of ancestors. Unable to participate in weddings and funerals with pagan rituals, African family life was becoming threatened. Christian convictions also proved to be a serious attack against social life in Roman Africa. Town council sessions typically opened with some act of pagan homage. Public festivals and ceremonies — gladiator games in the arena, chariot races around the circus, and plays that depicted mythological characters — were all inaugurated with sacrifices to the chief gods.'

12 Brown (2004), 192.

13 *Traditio apostolica* 19.2.

14 *Traditio apostolica* 20.1.

15 *Traditio apostolica* 21.25. See also *Constitutiones apostolicae* 7.44.

happen to come among them. 'That which is holy they will cast to the dogs, and their pearls,' although (to be sure) they are not real ones, 'they will fling to the swine.'[16]

Simpson explains:

> The fathers' hesitancy to transmit the Lord's Prayer was not determined by an effort to preserve a powerful formula for the church. Rather, they recognized that they were dealing with an element of God's self-revelation, the words and manner of prayer which were pleasing in his sight, the spiritual sacrifice of the new covenant, an element in the reconciliation of God and man — the good news of Jesus Christ. Such a prayer could not be lightly regarded or blandly used. It belonged neither to unbelievers nor to proclamation but to the life of the redeemed community.[17]

De oratione is one of three works which Tertullian apparently wrote for the preparation of catechumens, the other two being *De baptismo* and *De paenitentia*. The exegetical section of *De oratione* is written along the form of lecture notes. Simpson has commented that this portion

> is composed of a multiplicity of key ideas presented in rapid-fire order, hardly reflective of Tertullian's earlier career as a rhetorician. Hence this section is appropriately described as 'a homily, and indeed not the homily fully written out, but notes to help the preacher's presentation.'[18]

In his preface to *De baptismo* Tertullian states that such instruction

> will not be without purpose if it provides equipment for those who are at present under instruction, as well as those others who, content to have believed in simplicity, have not examined the reasons for what has been conferred upon them, and because of inexperience are burdened with a faith which is open to temptation.[19]

[16] *De praescriptione haereticorum* 41.

[17] Simpson (1965), 84.

[18] Simpson (1965), 22. He also notes additional indications of homily notes, including the address, 'Let us take note, therefore, O blessed ones' (*De oratione* 1.22.), and the abrupt final doxology (*De oratione* 29.34). Simpson suggests that the exegetical portion originally consisted of chapters 1-10 and 29, and that the additional instructions of found in 11-28 were inserted prior to publication.

[19] *Instruens tam eos qui cum maxime formantur quam et illos qui simpliciter credidisse contenti, non exploratis rationibus traditionum, temptabilem fidem per imperitiam portant* (*De baptismo* 1).

He believes that a faith able to withstand persecution and deception is a faith that grasps the rationality of the gospel. This same conviction and purpose encompasses his writing of *De oratione*.

II. Tertullian's Introductory Remarks (*De oratione* 1)

A. Summary

Tertullian begins his address with a declaration: 'The Spirit of God and the Word of God and the reason of God, the Word of reason and reason of the Word, both of which are spirit, namely Jesus Christ our Lord, marked out for his new disciples of the new covenant a new form of prayer.'[20] Just as a new bottle is required for new wine, and a new patch for a new garment, so it is fitting that a new prayer be given for the new grace of the gospel. The various forms and expressions of the Old Covenant are obsolete, for they have been transformed, or completed, or fulfilled, or perfected.[21] The previous carnal covenant has been replaced by the gospel, which is spiritual. In it, Christ is recognized as Spirit, Word, and Reason, and each of these characteristics has an active expression: that of *Spirit* is power, that of *Word* is the teaching of Christ, and that of *Reason* is incarnation.[22] In this same regard, the prayer given by the *Logos* has the same three components: *word*, *spirit* and *reason.* Each of these also has an active expression: 'the prayer which is instituted by Christ is made up of three parts: out of word, by which it is spoken, out of spirit, by which it is powerful, out of reason, in that it reconciles.'[23] Even though John had taught his disciples to pray, his purpose was to simply lay the foundation. The form of his prayer has not even been preserved, for earthly things have given way to the heavenly.[24]

Tertullian then asserts that there is a heavenly wisdom which applies to the recitation of this prayer. First, it is to be prayed in secret, as the believer trusts that God will hear.[25] Second, it is to be brief, for God is able

[20] *Dei spiritus et dei sermo et dei ratio, sermo rationis et ratio sermonis et spiritus utrumque, Iesus Christus dominus noster, novis discipulis novi testamenti novam orationis formam determinavit* (*De oratione* 1.1-4).

[21] *De oratione* 1.4-8.

[22] *De oratione* 1.8-12.

[23] *De oratione* 1.12-14.

[24] *De oratione* 1.14-19.

[25] *De oratione* 1.23-27.

to provide even without one's asking.[26] And third, the orants must bear in mind that 'as much as it is restricted in words, it is comprehensive in meaning.'[27] It is the summary of the entire gospel. It embraces every function of prayer, whether worship or petition, and it encompasses the entire 'discourse of the Lord' and 'the whole record of his instruction.'[28]

B. Prayer as the Expression of the Logos

Reflecting upon these Tertullian's opening remarks, we note that he begins his treatise declaring that Jesus Christ is Spirit, Word and Reason. With this, he not only lays the foundation for his exegesis, but he integrates his interpretation of the LP into his overall system of thought. In the *Apologeticus*, he has articulated his theology of the L*ogos* in the following manner:

> We have already asserted that God made the world, and all which it contains, by His Word, and Reason, and Power. It is abundantly plain that your philosophers, too, regard the Logos — that is, the Word and Reason — as the Creator of the universe. For Zeno lays it down that he is the creator, having made all things according to a determinate plan; that his name is Fate, and God, and the soul of Jupiter, and the necessity of all things. Cleanthes ascribes all this to spirit, which he maintains pervades the universe. And we, in like manner, hold that the Word, and Reason, and Power, by which we have said God made all, have spirit as their proper and essential substratum, in which the Word has in being to give forth utterances, and reason abides to dispose and arrange, and power is over all to execute.[29]

Tertullian views the *Logos* as the Word, Reason and Power by which God created and sustains the world.[30] He associates his conceptualization of the *Logos* with that of the Stoics, accurately noting that Zeno views the *Logos* as the creator who has made all things 'according to a determinate plan,' and that Cleanthes describes God as the spirit that 'pervades the universe.' Baltzly notes that in the Stoic system of thought,

[26] *De oratione* 1.27-30.

[27] *De oratione* 1.32-33.

[28] *De oratione* 1.35-37.

[29] *Apologeticus* 21.

[30] Although he does not use the transliterated term ***logos***, this passage from the *Apologeticus* makes it clear that it is precisely this concept which he has mind when he uses the terms ***Word*** (*sermo*) and *Reason* (*ratio*) in *De oratione* 1.

> God is identified with an eternal reason (logos, Diog. Laert. 44B) or intelligent designing fire (Aetius, 46A) which structures matter in accordance with Its plan ... the Stoic God does not craft its world in accordance with its plan from the outside ... Rather, the history of the universe is determined by God's activity internal to it, shaping it with its differentiated characteristics.[31]

It is in this same way that Tertullian characterizes Christ as the *Logos*, by whom all things have been created,[32] and who rationally disposes, arranges and executes all things according to his plan.

As with the Stoics, Tertullian characterizes the *Logos* as a dynamic force. Christ is recognized as Spirit, Word, and Reason, and each of these characteristics has an active expression: that of *Spirit* is power, that of *Word* is the teaching of Christ, and that of *Reason* is incarnation. In this same way, the prayer given by the *Logos* has the three components: *word, spirit* and *reason*, each with an active expression: the word of the prayer is spoken, the spirit of the prayer is powerful, and the reason of the prayer reconciles.[33] These are interdependent dynamics.[34] Prayer can neither reconcile nor is it powerful if it is not spoken; and it should not be spoken, nor can it reconcile, if it is not powerful; and it should not be spoken, and it is not powerful, if it does not reconcile.

Another characteristic of the *Logos,* as agreed upon by both the Stoics and Tertullian, is its immanence within the creation. For the Stoics, the *Logos* is the fire which permeates matter. For Tertullian, the *Logos* is the incarnate Christ. One of the mechanisms by which he 'disposes, arranges and executes' is the prayer of his church. On the lips of Christians, the LP functions as an active, internal force through which he orders and moves creation toward the fulfillment of its 'determinate plan.'

Thus, it is implicit in Tertullian's words that humans are not passive bystanders in the operation of the divine plan. The LP is the means by which the church is invited to participate in the activity of the *Logos*. It was 'marked out' (*determinavit*) and 'instituted' (*instituta*) by Christ. Its

[31] Baltzly, (2010). Although Diogenes Laertius is considered by many to be an inadequate source for ancient Greek philosophy, this broad statement certainly passes muster.

[32] Cf. John 1:3.

[33] *De oratione* 1.12-14.

[34] There is a propensity throughout his writings to employ the notion of *economy*, wherein diverse entities or concepts form an integrated, interdependent whole. He most often uses this term in reference to the Trinity [cf. Hall (2005), 71], but he will apply it within other frameworks as well.

divine *sermo* is constituted in the fact that it was given by Christ.[35] But the prayer is not complete without its human *sermo*. It must be spoken by the church.[36] Prayer thus requires the activity of both God and man. The initiative to teach this prayer and the power to answer it pertain to God, but the obedient act of *reciting it with faith* pertains to man. Thus, the LP begins and ends with God — but its purpose cannot be fulfilled apart from man.

C. *The New Prayer*

Another salient feature of Tertullian's introduction is his presentation of the LP as a 'new form of prayer' (*novam orationis formam*), which replaces the prayer of the Jews. Tertullian was what modern theologians would term a 'supersessionist.'[37] He here shows little interest in exploring any notion of continuity between the Old Testament concept of prayer and that taught by Jesus. In his eyes the Jews, because of their infidelity, have been replaced by the Christians.[38] The previous covenant has been supplanted by the new covenant in Christ.

[35] Brown (2004), 238, notes: 'Since Christ commands it, the Lord oversees the prayer's *sermo* by having taught it and its *ratio* by acting on the supplicant's behalf. Likewise, the Holy Spirit, in Tertullian's view, initiates prayer through its own guidance (cf. 1.1-2). Again, we see the activity of God as fundamental to Tertullian's theological vision. Even *sermo* and *ratio* describe God's activity. The terms are found most often in Tertullian's account of creation and its maintenance (see, e.g., *Prax.* 5.7; *Apol.* 6.21; *Herm.* 18). They are not static. They are expressions of divine action.'

[36] Holmes (1960), 29, notes that in Tertullian's writings there are more than two hundred passages in which he treats the topic of prayer, and that he regularly represents prayer not only as a duty, but a right (*postulare*).

[37] See Tertullian *Adversus Judaeos* 3. Barnes (1971), 106, comments that in this work Tertullian 'set out to demonstrate that the Christians had inherited the privileged position once enjoyed by the Jews as the people of god. He sketched the gradual revelation of God's law in the Old Testament and its replacement by the New Covenant.'

[38] Throughout his works, Tertullian exhibits an overall negative attitude toward the Jews. They were 'the seedplot of all the calumny against us' (*Ad nationes* 1.14.2), and the Jewish synagogues were the 'fountains of persecution' (*Scorpiace* 10.10). Barnes (1971), 92, describes Tertullian's thoughts toward the Jews in the following way: 'The Jews and the Israel who people the pages of Tertullian are the nation of the Bible. The Old Testament provided a small number of important arguments for the truth of Christianity and an inexhaustible supply of examples and pronouncements with which to edify the faithful or confute heretics. Tertullian therefore sought to define the correct principles of hermeneutics, and perpetually discussed biblical history. Antisemitism was the natural consequence.'

> Whatever was of the old has either been transformed, as has circumcision, or else completed, as was the remainder of the law, or fulfilled, as prophecy has been, or perfected, as is faith itself. As the Gospel has been introduced as the completion of everything of antiquity, the new grace of God has renewed all things from fleshly being into spiritual being.[39]

The transformation of prayer is, in Tertullian's eyes, a progression of flesh to spirit. 'Earthly things must yield to heavenly.'[40] His framing of this progression bears a certain resemblance to the Stoic idea of *anastoicheosis,* a process in which flesh is transformed into spirit. In the Stoic view, 'elements may be transformed into one another, and consequently the matter of bodily flesh can become the air and fire that make up the *pneuma*.'[41] Buch-Hansen has suggested that Philo employed this idea with regard to the transformation of Moses (*De vita Mosis* 2.288),[42] and that it also informed John's understanding of the *pneuma* in his Gospel. It has elsewhere been argued that Paul's account of the resurrection in 1 Cor. 15 'presupposes a basically Stoic understanding of the πνευμα that will eventually transform human bodies of flesh and blood into "pneumatic bodies," that is, into material bodies that are now made up by πνευμα instead of flesh and blood.'[43] Tertullian, thus, was not the first, nor the only Christian author, to integrate this idea into his thinking. His allusion to *anastoicheosis* serves a pragmatic purpose in this case, as he simply seeks to demonstrate that prayer in Christ has progressed from the earthly and inferior to something heavenly and superior. 'Whoever is of the earth ... speaks earthly things... And whatever is heavenly is of the Lord Christ, as is this rule of prayer likewise.'[44]

D. *Wisdom in Prayer*

Tertullian concludes his opening remarks by noting three applications of 'heavenly wisdom' in the area of prayer. First, in what may be a reference to the volatile situation of the church in that time, Tertullian reminds his audience that God hears prayer whether it be uttered in houses or

39 *De oratione* 1.6.

40 *De oratione* 1.19

41 Buch-Hansen (2010), 59.

42 Buch-Hansen (2010), 351

43 Engberg-Pedersen (2010), 9.

44 *De oratione* 1.20-22.

hidden chambers. God demands, however, full belief and confidence in His ability to answer prayer, regardless of the setting where it is offered. His second point is that they need not be concerned about the brevity of the LP, for 'as much as it is restricted in words, it is comprehensive in meaning.'[45] And Tertullian's third point is that the LP is not only the recapitulation of 'all occasions of prayer,' including divine worship and human petition, but of the whole gospel.[46]

Tertullian's concept of this 'heavenly wisdom' reflects a Greco-Roman cultural understanding of prayer. Michael Brown notes that the Greeks and the Romans each had unique concerns in prayer:

> Roman prayer was closely regulated by religious professionals whose duty was to make sure that *certa verba*, or at least *concepta verba*, were used in the performance of a ritual. Otherwise, a prayer lost its efficacy. Philosophical Greek religion was concerned with such matters as language, also, but with a different aim in mind. Greek religion was concerned with the εθος of the orant, while Roman religion was interested in the efficacy of the linguistic and liturgical construction of the prayer. In other words, while both religions followed particular prayer forms, the emphasis in philosophical Greek religion fell primarily on the *performer* and in Roman religion on the *performance*.[47]

Tertullian's view reflects elements from both of these perspectives. On the one hand, he has stressed the comprehensive character of the LP. It is the perfect prayer, summing up all prayers, and the gospel itself. Even though it is brief, it is the consummate prayer which needs no supplement nor modification. On the other hand, Tertullian also stresses the importance of the measure and proportion of faith of the one who

[45] De oratione 1.32-33. It here becomes evident that the church in Carthage had the custom of praying through the LP without pause, and without amplification. This is made even more apparent in chapter ten, where Tertullian makes allowance, after the LP has been recited, for 'a secondary top-storey of pleas for additional desires on the foundation, as it were, of our rehearsal of the proper and normal prayer.' (*De oratione* 10.4-6)

[46] Simpson (1965), 47, argues that Tertullian's characterization of the LP as the recapitulation of the gospel is determinative to his exegesis of the prayer: 'The gospel contained in the instruction of Jesus Christ, which the Lord's Prayer brings to summary expression, includes both that which God is and that which man must become. And this idea controls Tertullian's interpretation.' I am not persuaded, however, that this eastern notion of *theosis* is so prominent in Tertullian's thought.

[47] Brown (2004), 55-56.

prays.[48] The efficacy of prayer is not grounded in the verbosity of the orant, but rather in the good disposition of the Father to respond to his children. The recitation of the LP is not an exercise in magic.[49] Proper wording is important, but this prayer is more than just a formula or a transaction. It is an expression of relational trust in the God who sees and hears.[50]

III. Tertullian's Exegesis of the Lord's Prayer

*A. God as Father (*De oratione *2)*

1. Summary

For Tertullian, the opening address of the LP is an affirmation of the identity of God as Father, and the concomitant duty of his children to honor Him by means of their faith. 'It begins with bearing witness to God and with the reward of faith when we say, "Father, you who are in the heavens." For we are praying to God and confessing the faith of which this mode of address is an indication.'[51] The church calls him 'Fa-

[48] 'There is further wisdom in the command which follows, which likewise pertains to the measure of faith and the proportion of faith, that we should not consider going to God, of whose regard for those who are his own is assured, with an army of words.' (*De oratione* 1.27-30)

[49] Against Simpson (1965), 95, who argues that 'the Lord's Prayer secures God's hearing and empowers the other petitions with efficacy. Christ "has conferred upon it [prayer] all power concerning good" (29.39). Thus we seem to have "arrived" at the point of concluding once more that Tertullian moves within the realm of manipulative magic.'

[50] 'He demands that a person believe, in that he should be confident in the ability of the almighty God to hear and to see ... that he should trust him who is everywhere too hear and to see, and should offer his devotion to him alone.' (*De oratione* 1.24-27)

[51] *De oratione* 2.1-3. Tertullian follows neither the Matthean nor Lukan form of the opening address, and his form follows no other known Latin texts. Geoffrey Dunn (2004), 20, notes that Tertullian had a proclivity to implement his own translations from the Greek Gospel texts, and thus he did not always pay heed to what may have been the more common translations. Tertullian was not ignorant of the fact that other forms of the LP were in use. In *De oratione* he cites the opening address as, *Pater qui in caelis es*, and in *Adversus Praxean* 23 he quotes it as *Pater noster qui es in caelis*. Throughout Tertullian's exegesis of the LP in *De oratione*, it will be noted that his rendering of the prayer's text, in both wording and order, is unique to him. Moffat (1919), 25, suggests that Tertullian's text probably reflects the form of prayer current at that time, and that the prayer did not yet have a fixed liturgical form in Latin. Given that Tertullian's text of the LP differs from that of Cyprian and Augustine — who both lived in the region of Carthage, and not long after Tertullian — Moffat's suggestion

ther' because He has commanded His people to address Him as such; something which the Jews failed to do.[52] Tertullian argues that it is not a sterile form of address, but rather it is a joy to acknowledge God as Father.[53] And 'it is a form of address which demonstrates both devotion and power.'[54] The fact that *potestas* is an outflow of *pietas* is demonstrated by John 1:12, 'To those who believe in him, he gave the power to be called children of God.'[55]

Tertullian concludes his remarks by noting that to address God as Father is also to recognize 'those who are his.'[56] This is to invoke the Son, 'for now we know that the Son is the new name of the Father.'[57] But this is also to recognize the place of the church, 'Nor is the mother, the church neglected, since the mother is found within the Father and the Son, for the name of Father and Son find their meaning in her.'[58]

2. Elucidation

In Greco-Roman society, there was a certain ethos, or *pietas* which characterized the relationship between the *paterfamilias* and his children. 'Pietas denoted, above all, conformity to normal, traditional, indisputable relationships,' and 'the scrupulous and conscientious attention to maintaining a proper relationship with others, whether human or divine.'[59] It required both the recognition of these relationships, and the commitment and duty which these relationships mandated. Epictetus aptly characterizes the notion of *pietas* in the father-son relationship:

seems unlikely. My own position is that the liturgical form of the LP was fixed at this time. Tertullian takes for granted that the prayer will be recited by his audience according to the prescribed form. The liberty he takes in paraphrasing may simply be another instance wherein he prefers to work with his own translation.

52 *De Oratione* 2.6-7.

53 *De oratione* 2:7-10. Tertullian has previously noted in *Apologeticus* 34 that *pater* is a more affectionate address than *dominus*: 'How can he, who is truly father of his country, be its lord? The name of piety is more grateful than the name of power; so the heads of families are called fathers rather than lords.'

54 *appellatio ista et pietatis et potestatis est* (*De oratione* 2.11).

55 *De oratione* 2.3-4.

56 *De oratione* 2.15.

57 *De oratione* 3.3.

58 *De oratione* 2.13-14.

59 Brown, (2004), 56.

> Next, remember that you are a son. What is the commitment made by this role? That he considers all that is his own as being under his father's sway, that he obeys him in all matters, never criticizes him to someone else, and neither says nor does anything to harm him, defers to him, and concedes to him on all occasions, cooperating with him as much as he can.'[60]

Tertullian's explication of *Father* is laden with the same sensibility. The appellation demonstrates devotion (*pietas*) in that there is an intimate and yet honoring relationship in place. But the appellation also demonstrates power (*potestas*), because the right understanding of the relationship is what makes prayer effective. When one renders to God what is rightfully His, namely faith, His power is at work on their behalf.

Also notable in Tertullian's remarks is his effort to create an economy, i.e. the ordering of complex parts into a single, inter-related whole. By the simple address of 'Father,' the orant also calls upon the Son. And through this same invocation, the mother church is also remembered: 'Since the mother is found within the Father and the Son, for the name of the Father and Son find their meaning in her.'[61] In this statement, Tertullian is not framing a *Trinity* of Father, Son and Church. He has said in *De baptismo* 6 that 'after the pledging both of the attestation of faith and the promise of salvation under "three witnesses," there is added, of necessity, mention of the Church; inasmuch as, wherever there are three, (that is, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit,) there is the Church, which is a body of three.' His reasoning is that in the *economy* of God, the designations of Father and Son necessitate the existence of a mother.[62]

B. *The Hallowing of the Name (*De oratione *3)*

1. Summary

When the church prays, 'Let your name be hallowed,'[63] Tertullian says that it is the name of the Father, as manifested in Jesus, 'whose hallow-

[60] *Diatribai* 2.10.7.

[61] *De oratione* 2.13-14.

[62] Stewart-Sykes (2004), 43, notes that this line of thought would be reflected in the later writings of Cyprian, who said, 'He can no longer have God for his Father, who has not the Church for his mother.' (*De unitate ecclesiae* 6)

[63] *Sanctificetur nomen tuum*, which is consistent with other ancient versions. We bear in mind that our present focus is on the *lemmata* of the LP as it is found in *De*

ing we beseech.'[64] He is at pains to argue, however, that the honoring of the name does not derive from any divine deficiency or need. 'Not because it is fitting for people to give God our good wishes, as though there were another from whom it might be possible that such wishes be received, or as though he might be in trouble did we not wish him well.'[65] For God's name is always holy and hallowed. The angels hallow God's name in heaven, saying, 'Holy, holy, holy.'[66] Thus, the hallowing of the name which the church now renders to God is the prolepsis of the heavenly worship that is to come. And finally, Tertullian ascribes to this petition an intercessory character. The church has been commanded to pray for all, and so the request is not only for the people of God, but also those others 'whom the grace of God still awaits.'[67]

2. The Necessity of Prayer

In this section Tertullian wrestles with a matter that will occupy his attention throughout his exegesis of LP, namely, how to reconcile the sovereignty of God with and the necessity of prayer. He here initiates what will be a sustained strategy to strike a nuanced position. He asserts that God's name is already both holy and hallowed in heaven. And yet God has also commanded His people to pray that His name may be hallowed amongst themselves and others. In other words, the fullness of the Deity is unaffected by human activity, and yet God desires humans to align themselves to His will.

A tension is here present that Tertullian does not fully resolve, and it relates to the notion of *need* within the LP. Michael Brown has noted that this prayer

> envisions a socially integrated universe in which the relationship between God and creation involves the expression and fulfillment of

oratione. While a more thorough discussion of the relationship between Tertullian's text, the *Vetus Latina* and the Vulgate would be of interest at this point, its relevance would only pertain to the Latin text of Matthew's Gospel, and would not illuminate our understanding of Tertullian. Furthermore, if we were to consult the *Vetus Latina*, we would only ascertain Tertullian's particular form of the prayer on the basis of these same *lemmata*.

64 *De oratione* 3.6.

65 *Non quod deceat homines bene deo optare, quasi sit et alius de quo ei possit optari, aut laboret nisi optemus* (*De oratione* 3.6-8).

66 Cf. Isaiah 6:3.

67 *De oratione* 3.19.

> needs on both sides. The LP assumes that God is a God with certain needs: to have his name sanctified, his kingdom come, and his will be done. Likewise, human beings have particular needs that must be brought before God.[68]

Tertullian is aware of the fact that a logical analysis results in this conclusion. He is unwilling to concede that God has needs. But since prayer has been commanded, it must somehow be necessary. As I have mentioned above, his resolution of this tension is nuanced. One aspect of his argument suggests that there is a separation between what happens in heaven and what happens on earth. God's name is currently hallowed in heaven, and Christians on earth will someday participate in that heavenly worship. Yet on earth, God's name is not fully hallowed in the church, and it still awaits hallowing by those who will join the fold.

There is here seen another aspect of Tertullian's argument that derives from Stoic thought, and that is the notion of the ***harmony of opposites***. Stoic philosophers were comfortable with a high degree of paradox. They believed that seemingly contradictory forces could result in a sense of harmony or balance. Osborn describes the harmony of opposites in the following way:

> Stoicism took the harmony of opposites as the fundamental feature of nature under the control of reason. It is to the Hymn of Cleanthes that we owe the clearest statement of Heraclitean strife, moderated by divine reason. 'But you know how to make the crooked straight and to order things disorderly. You love things unloved. For you have so welded into one all things; good and bad, that they share in a single everlasting reason' (LongSedley, 54 1, SVF, 1.537). According to Chrysippus, those who object to providence because of the existence of troubles and evils are foolish. Good and evil 'must necessarily exist in opposition to each other and supported by a kind of opposed interdependence' ... Epictetus wrote, 'Zeus has ordained that there be summer and winter, plenty and poverty, virtue and vice and all such opposites for the sake of the harmony of the whole.' (Diss. 1, 12, 165)[69]

In Tertullian's comments on this petition, we get our first indication that he was also comfortable with this line of reasoning. His thought in this regard is evident throughout his works, most notably in *Adversus*

[68] Brown (2004), 153.

[69] Osborn (1997), 72

Marcionem.[70] In order to understand Tertullian, one must understand how this harmony of opposites shapes his worldview. In *De oratione*, he does not take time to *flesh out* this idea, but it certainly colors his interpretation of this petition, and those that will follow.

C. *The Will of God (*De oratione *4)*

1. Summary

Tertullian continues his treatise with an explication of the petition, 'Let your will be done in the heavens and the earth.'[71] Once again, he asserts that the act of petitioning God in prayer in no way implies that there is a divine deficiency or need: 'We are asking that his will be done in all people and not, because somebody is resisting the will of God, out of a need to pray that he be successful in implementing it.'[72] What the church requests in this petition is alignment. Flesh must yield to spirit and earth must yield to heaven,[73] and this occurs when the church submits to His instructions.[74] Hence, the essence of this request is for the ability to live in the obedience that leads to salvation, which is the

[70] Osborn (1997), 72, characterizes the central theme of *Adversus Marcionem* as this: 'God's antitheses are reflected in his own world which consists of opposite elements regulated in perfect proportion; but the antithesis (like the economy) belongs first in God and not merely in his world.' This is seen, for example, in *Adversus Marcionem* 1.16: 'We affirm, then, that this diversity of things visible and invisible must on this ground be attributed to the Creator, even because the whole of His work consists of diversities — of things corporeal and incorporeal; of animate and inanimate; of vocal and mute; of moveable and stationary; of productive and sterile; of arid and moist; of hot and cold. Man, too, is himself similarly tempered with diversity, both in his body and in his sensation. Some of his members are strong, others weak; some comely, others uncomely; some twofold, others unique; some like, others unlike. In like manner there is diversity also in his sensation: now joy, then anxiety; now love, then hatred; now anger, then calmness. Since this is the case, inasmuch as the whole of this creation of ours has been fashioned with a reciprocal rivalry amongst its several parts, the invisible ones are due to the visible, and not to be ascribed to any other author than Him to whom their counterparts are imputed, marking as they do diversity in the Creator Himself, who orders what He forbade, and forbids what He ordered; who also strikes and heals.' See also *Adversus Marcionem* 2.12.

[71] *De oratione* 4.1-2. Note that Tertullian places the petition for the *will* before the *kingdom*. The text of his petition reads, *Fiat voluntas tua in caelis et in terra*. With the absence of *sicut*, his rendering is the same as Cyprian and the African Bible, but differs from Augustine (cf. Stewart-Sykes (2004), 39). See note 63.

[72] *De oratione* 4.2-4.

[73] *De oratione* 4.4-8.

[74] *De oratione* 4.8-9.

sum total of God's will for His children.[75] Obedience to God's will has been modeled by Christ, who did not do his own will, but that of the Father.[76] The church is now challenged by his example, and the 'ability to do these things is through the will of God.'[77]

Tertullian goes on to say that this petition highlights the church's need for endurance. For 'there is nothing evil in the will of God,'[78] and the people of God must accept whatever befalls them, whether it be deserved or undeserved.[79] For Christ had suffered, and in order to demonstrate the weakness of the flesh, he asked for the cup to be removed. But he then submitted his own will to that of the Father.[80] And this was done by him who was 'the will and the power of the father.'[81]

2. Divine Providence and Human Freedom

In Tertullian's opening remarks on this petition, he declares that no one can resist the will of God, and that human prayer can have no bearing on God's success in carrying it out. Thus, it would seem at the outset that Tertullian viewed the execution of the divine will as completely independent of human activity. He goes on to say, however, that the doing of God's will is brought about by obedience. God's will is done when people obey, and God's will is not done when people do not follow His commands. Therefore the church, ever mindful of the example of Christ, prays for God's help to obey. Tertullian's argument once again appears to result in a contradiction: On the one hand he insists that no one can resist the will of God, and that no human activity can assist Him in bringing it to pass. On the other hand, he says that God's will is only accomplished when people obey. To explore this paradox, we must again turn to Stoic thought.

Stoics believed in the inalterable path of Providence (*fatum*), and yet at the same time, they maintained that the human will is free. They argued that the existence of evil serves as evidence that Providence does

[75] *De oratione* 4.9-11.

[76] *De oratione* 4.11-16.

[77] *Quae ut implore possimus opus est dei voluntate* (*De oratione* 4.16-17).

[78] *De oratione* 4.18-19.

[79] *De oratione* 4.19.

[80] *De oratione* 4.21-24.

[81] *De oratione* 4.24.

not control human behavior.[82] Man is rational, his reason emanates from the divine reason, and he may choose to do what is good or what is evil. But no human activity or decision can have any final bearing on the course of events in the cosmos. Greene describes this aspect of Stoic thought in the following way:

> What must be, must be; but man, by his insight, may will to do what must be done, and so may act in harmony with nature; or, again, he may resist. The result, considered externally, will be the same in either case, for man cannot overrule Nature, or Fate; but by willing cooperation, by making its law his law, he can find happiness, or by resignation he can at least find peace.[83]

By living 'according to nature,' that is, living according to the ethical standard determined by the natural order, man can bring good upon himself and others. If he chooses not to live in this way, he is in no way altering the natural course of the created order — but he will bring harm upon himself and others. Edwin Hatch summarized the thought of the Stoic philosophers Cleanthes, Chrysippus and Epictetus in this way:

> The world marches on to its end, realizing its own perfection, with absolute certainty. The majority of its parts move in that march unconsciously, with no sense of pleasure or pain, no idea of good or evil. To man is given the consciousness of action, the sense of pleasure and pain, the idea of good and evil, and freedom of choice between them. If he chooses that which is against the movement of nature, he chooses for himself misery; if he chooses that which is in accordance with that movement, he finds happiness. In either case the movement of nature goes on, and the man fulfils his destiny ... It is a man's true function and

[82] Greene (1968), 344-345, notes that, 'Cleanthes, perceiving the fact of evil, sought to relieve Providence, though not Fate, from responsibility for it, arguing (unlike Chrysippus) that though all that comes through Providence is also fated, not all that is fated is providential. He goes further, and places the moral responsibility for evil squarely on the shoulders of man, holding that God nevertheless knows how to make evil contribute to good. Thus in his Hymn ... he continues, attributing all to God's purpose:

> Save what the sinner works infatuate,
> Nay, but thou knowest to make crooked straight.
> Chaos to thee is order; in thine eyes
> The unloved is lovely, who did'st harmonize
> Things evil with things good, that there should be
> One Word through all things everlastingly.'

[83] Greene (1968), 340.

> high privilege so to educate his mind and discipline his will, as to think that to be best which is really best, and that to be avoided which nature has not willed: in other words, to acquiesce in the will of God, not as submitting in passive resignation to the power of one who is stronger, but as having made that will his own.[84]

In this form of thinking, nature is an active force, like a river that is flowing in an inalterable direction, toward a determined destination. Man is caught up in the flow of this river, and the fundamental choice he must make is whether he will swim with, or against its current.

Tertullian's concept of God's will in many ways parallels Stoic thought. We have noted that in *De oratione* he characterizes God's will as an active force operating in the present, to which man can yield or resist.[85] And at the same time, he views the will of God as the *telos* of Creation, which is irresistible and inalterable.[86] Thus, the will of God does not determine all human activity, but the will of God does dictate the final outcome of history.

Tertullian, as the Stoics, points to the existence of both good and evil as evidence that the human will is free. In *Adversus Marcionem*[87] for example, he writes:

> Entire freedom of will, therefore, was conferred upon him in both tendencies; so that, as master of himself, he might constantly encounter good by spontaneous observance of it, and evil by its spontaneous avoidance; because, were man even otherwise circumstanced, it was yet his bounden duty, in the judgment of God, to do justice according to the motions of his will regarded, of course, as free. But the reward neither of good nor of evil could be paid to the man who should be found to have been either good or evil through necessity and not choice. In this really lay the law which did not exclude, but rather prove, human liberty by a spontaneous rendering of obedience, or a spontaneous commission of iniquity; so patent was the liberty of man's will for either issue.[88]

84 Hatch (1957), 222.

85 *De oratione* 4.2-4; 9-10.

86 *De oratione* 4.2-3.

87 Written around 207-208, the purpose of this work was to reconcile (what Marcion claimed to be) the dispartity between the character of God in the Old and New Testaments. Whereas Marcion argued that they were, in fact, two different Gods, Tertullian set out to demonstrate that the diverse manifestations of God's character were consistent with His ultimate goodness.

88 *Adversus Marcionem* 2.6 See also 2.5; 2.9.

In his work *De exhortatione castitatis*[89] Tertullian once again makes an argument for the independence of the human will, and explores its relationship to the divine will:

> It is not the part of good and solid faith to refer all things to the will of God in such a manner as that; and that each individual should so flatter himself by saying that 'nothing is done without His permission,' as to make us fail to understand that there is a something in our own power. Else every sin will be excused if we persist in contending that nothing is done by us without the will of God; and that definition will go to the destruction of (our) whole discipline, (nay), even of God Himself; if either He produce by His own will things which He wills not, or else (if) there is nothing which God wills not.
>
> And accordingly we ought not to lay to the account of the LORD's will that which lies subject to our own choice; (on the hypothesis) that He does not will, or else (positively) nills what is good, who does nill what is evil. Thus, it is a volition of our own when we will what is evil, in antagonism to God's will, who wills what is good. Further, if you inquire whence comes that volition whereby we will anything in antagonism to the will of God, I shall say, it has its source in ourselves.
>
> Therefore, since the only thing which is in our power is volition — and it is herein that our mind toward God is put to proof, whether we will the things which coincide with His will.[90]

Thus, the human person is given free will, and she is able to assent to, or resist God's will.[91] The aspiration of the Christian is to 'will the things which coincide with' the will of God. This is Tertullian's version of 'living according to nature.'

Over against his conceptualization of human free will, there is also to be found in Tertullian's thought the notion of an overarching providence which directs human history toward its ultimate *telos*. The culmination of human history is the vindication of God's righteous character and the manifestation of his absolute goodness and justice; it is the salvation of those who believe and the condemnation of the unbelieving.

[89] This particular work deals with the matter of remarriage after the death of one's spouse. Written is his later years (208-209), *De exortatione castitatis* reflects the rigidity which characterizes his Montanist leanings. However, his thinking with regard to the will of God is broadly consistent with his earlier works.

[90] *De exhortatione castitatis* 2.2; 4-5; 8.

[91] See also *Adversus Marcionem* 2.5; 7.

All things are working toward this end, and no human activity can alter this course upon which Creation has been set.

An example of Tertullian's thinking in this regard is found, again, in *Adversus Marcionem*. He there argues that God created the world in goodness and justice,[92] and that it was out of God's goodness that He gave man free will.[93] In the beginning, the goodness of God was manifest without opposition, 'But yet, when evil afterwards broke out, and the goodness of God began now to have an adversary to contend against, God's justice also acquired another function, even that of directing His goodness according to men's application for it.'[94] God offers his goodness to the worthy, and denies it to the unthankful.

> The entire office of justice in this respect becomes an agency for goodness: whatever it condemns by its judgment, whatever it chastises by its condemnation, whatever ... it ruthlessly pursues, it, in fact, benefits with good instead of injuring... Thus God is wholly good, because in all things He is on the side of good.[95]

According to Tertullian, the goodness of God will always prevail. Man will exercise his free will, sometimes choosing to obey God's commands, and sometimes choosing evil. But God in His resourcefulness will always do what is necessary to bring about the good, which is the manifestation of His own justice and righteous character:

> He will be moved, but not subverted. All appliances He must needs use, because of all contingencies; as many sensations as there are causes: anger because of the wicked, and indignation because of the ungrateful, and jealousy because of the proud, and whatsoever else is a hinderance to the evil. So, again, mercy on account of the erring, and patience

[92] He argues in *Adversus Marcionem* 2.12: 'In short, from the very first the Creator was both good and also just. And both His attributes advanced together. His goodness created, His justice arranged, the world; and in this process it even then decreed that the world should be formed of good materials, because it took counsel with goodness.'

[93] *Adversus Marcionem* 2.7 states: 'For, since He had once for all allowed (and, as we have shown, worthily allowed) to man freedom of will and mastery of himself, surely He from His very authority in creation permitted *these gifts* to be enjoyed: to be enjoyed, too, so far as lay in Himself, according to His own character as God, that is, for good (for who would permit anything hostile to himself?).'

[94] *Adversus Marcionem* 2.13.

[95] *Adversus Marcionem* 2.13.

> on account of the impenitent, and pre-eminent resources on account of the meritorious, and *whatsoever is necessary to the good*.[96]

God will be 'moved but not subverted' (*movebitur sed non evertetur*). God is affected by the activities of men. He acts and He reacts, as they exercise their free will. But ultimately, God will triumph in His purpose for humanity.

When Tertullian insists that no one can resist the will of God, and that no human activity can assist Him in bringing it to pass, he is in effect saying that God's ultimate purpose for His creation will not be thwarted. This purpose, as articulated throughout the works of Tertullian, is the salvation of those who believe and the manifestation of his perfect justice and goodness. Thus, on one hand, there is a fixed, unalterable element of God's will. On the other hand, there is also a conditional element to it as well.[97] He desires 'that we should act in accordance with his direction' and He wills 'the salvation of those of those he has adopted.'[98] But women and men must make right choices for themselves. They have the freedom to obey or disobey God's commands. Consequently, the church must seek God's assistance in the task of obedience, and this is what she does when she prays: 'let your will be done.'

D. *The Kingdom of God (*De oratione *5)*

1. Summary

Tertullian's thought regarding the Kingdom of God is a continuation of the previous argument:

[96] *Adversus Marcionem* 2.16, emphasis mine.

[97] In Tertullian's view, God's will is not always done in individual lives, but it ultimately will be accomplished for the whole of creation. This tension is similar to that found in Stoic thought, which maintained that the choices of individuals would have no bearing on the final outcome of human history. The difficulty of maintaining this separation between the *summands* and the *summation* of human activity was not lost upon the critics of Stoicism, namely Plutarch, who argued that Stoicism ultimately collapsed into determinism [cf. Greene (1968), 337-370]. What appears to be Tertullian's resolution of this problem is the notion that the exercise of human freedom does *in fact* contribute to the fulfillment of God's ultimate purpose. Because mankind has been endowed with divine reason, many will in fact choose to believe. God's goodness and justice will be manifest as He rewards each person according to her deeds, and the power of Christ will result in the salvation of those who have believed.

[98] *De oratione* 4.8-9, 11.

> 'May your Kingdom come' likewise pertains to the same matter as 'let your will be done,' namely among ourselves. For when is God, in whose hand is the heart of all kings not the king? But whatever we choose we suppose to be his, and we attribute to him whatever we hope for from him.[99]

God desires to openly manifest his kingdom, and He has put this desire and expectation in His people.[100] Consequently, it is not fitting that the church should ask for a prolongation of the world when the coming of the kingdom is in fact 'the consummation of the world.'[101] Even if she had not been instructed to pray as such, the church should desire the speedy coming of the kingdom, for this is what even the martyrs in heaven pray.[102] So, the petition for the coming of the kingdom is a request for its hastening. It is 'the desire of Christians, the confounding of the gentiles, the joy of angels, for which we are afflicted, for which we pray all the more fervently.'[103]

2. Elucidation

We see in these remarks that Tertullian once again presents a nuanced theology of prayer. There is a separation between what occurs in heaven, and what happens now on earth, between the ultimate fulfillment of God's purposes and the exercise of human free will.[104] In asking the question, 'For when is God not king?' he once again reminds his audience that this petition does not reflect any need or deficiency in God. In heaven He is fully in control and his kingdom is fully established there. It is on earth where the kingdom is yet to be consummated, and where the 'gentiles' do not submit to His authority. This petition is summarized as a request for the hastening of the kingdom's arrival on earth.

[99] *De oratione* 5.1-4. The last sentence reads, *sed quicquid nobis optamus in illum auguramur, et illi deputamus quod AD illo expectamus.*

[100] *De oratione* 5.5-6.

[101] *De oratione* 5.6-8. Tertullian here contradicts what he has said elsewhere: 'Without ceasing, for all our emperors we offer prayer. We pray for life prolonged; for security to the empire; for protection to the imperial house; for brave armies, a faithful senate, a virtuous people, the world at rest, whatever, as man or Cæsar, an emperor would wish.' (*Apologeticus* 30)

[102] *De oratione* 5.9-13.

[103] *De oratione* 5.15-17.

[104] It may be for this reason that Tertullian reversed the order of the petitions regarding the will of God and the kingdom. Cf. Simpson (1965), 97n.

Notable in Tertullian's remarks are his thoughts regarding God's shaping of the human heart: 'But whatever we choose we suppose to be his, and we attribute to him whatever we hope for from him.'[105] These words should not be interpreted in a deterministic sense, as if Tertullian were saying that God controls human choices and hopes. Tertullian strongly advocated the notion of human free will, particularly in his work *Adversus Marcionem*.[106] His point in *De oratione* is this: ***It is to be supposed*** (or expected) that the human will submitted to God's will chooses what God chooses, and desires what God desires (which is, in this case, the establishment of the kingdom on earth). God does not force His children to elect or hope for anything, but He shapes the heart of those who submit to Him.

With regard to the timing of the kingdom, Tertullian's interpretation is wholly eschatological. Throughout his works, Tertullian at no point demonstrates a vision for the transformation of the present earthly realm. 'One thing in this life greatly concerns us,' he once said, 'and that is, to get quickly out of it.'[107] The citizenship of the Christian was in heaven, and not on earth:

> But as for you, you are a foreigner in this world, a citizen of Jerusalem, the city above. Our citizenship, the apostle says, is in heaven. You have your own registers, your own calendar; you have nothing to do with the

[105] *De oratione* 5.3-4. See the Latin text in note 99.

[106] An outline of these arguments is as follows:

Man is free because he was created in the image of God: 'I find, then, that man was by God constituted free, master of his own will and power, indicating the presence of God's image and likeness in him by nothing so well as by this constitution of his nature.' (*Adversus Marcionem* 2.5)

The giving of the Law presupposes human freedom: 'For a law would not be imposed upon one who had it not in his power to render that obedience which is due to law; nor again, would the penalty of death be threatened against sin, if a contempt of the law were impossible to man in the liberty of his will.' (*Adversus Marcionem* 2.5)

Reward and judgment only make sense in light of human freedom: 'But the reward neither of good nor of evil could be paid to the man who should be found to have been either good or evil through necessity and not choice.' (*Adversus Marcionem* 2.6)

The existence of evil cannot be attributed to God, and therefore must be the result of human free will: 'God's action is purged from all imputation to evil. For the liberty of the will will not retort its own wrong on Him by whom it was bestowed, but on him by whom it was improperly used.' (*Adversus Marcionem* 2.9)

See also the discussion above 'Divine Providence and Human Freedom.'

[107] *Apologeticus* 41.

> joys of the world; nay, you are called to the very opposite, for 'the world shall rejoice, but ye shall mourn.'[108]

Tertullian's perspective was indicative of the contemporary sentiment. Decret points out that

> In Tertullian's day, the Christian movement did not integrate into the life of the African city or pursue social justice. The church perfectly tolerated the Roman Empire and the African society to which it belonged and managed to focus effectively on its interests, which did not include challenging the political order.[109]

Tertullian simply believed that the Day of the Lord was near, and consequently he 'did not seem interested in promoting mankind's earthly development.'[110]

*E. Daily Bread (*De oratione *6)*

1. Summary

As Tertullian begins his remarks on the fourth petition, he acknowledges that the nature of this request is for 'earthly needs.'[111] He goes on to say, however, that 'Give us this day our daily bread'[112] is better understood in a spiritual sense. For Jesus had said, "I am the bread of life," and the 'bread is the word of the living God.'[113] And his body is the bread of the Eucharist.[114] He concludes that 'when we ask for our daily bread, we are asking that we should perpetually be in Christ and that we should not be separated from his body.'[115]

As Tertullian continues his reflections on the bread, his primary concern is to reiterate that even though a material understanding of bread is allowable, its deepest significance is in the spiritual realm.[116] When Je-

[108] *De corona* 13.

[109] Decret (2009), 44.

[110] Decret (2009), 44.

[111] *De oratione* 6.3.

[112] The Latin text is consistent with contemporary versions, *panem nostrum quotidianum da nobis hodie.*

[113] *De oratione* 6.8-9.

[114] *De oratione* 6.10.

[115] *De oratione* 6.10-12.

[116] *De oratione* 6.12-13.

sus spoke of bread in his parables, it was always a metaphor for spiritual provision.[117] The Gentiles preoccupy themselves with material gain.[118] The children of God are not to share in their anxiety. Thus, although there may be a material sense within this petition, it is limited. For the church only requests one day's provision, and thus follow Christ's command to, 'Take no thought for what you should eat tomorrow.'[119]

2. Elucidation

This same line of interpretation is also seen in his later work *De ieiunio*, where Tertullian states:

> (He) who was wont to profess 'food' to be, not that which His disciples had supposed, but 'the thorough doing of the Father's work;' teaching 'to labour for the meat which is permanent unto life eternal;' in our ordinary prayer likewise commanding us to request 'bread,' not the wealth of Attalus therewithal.[120]

Various suggestions have been set forth as to why Tertullian had such a discomfort with a material application for this petition. Michael Brown suggests that,

> Being somewhat insulated from the vagaries of the production and distribution of food, it is understandable that high-status Christians would be somewhat disinclined to further the idea that a thoroughly benevolent God should be asked for something as necessary to survival as food.[121]

And yet at the same time, Tertullian would have sought to avoid the implication that 'God was not fundamentally concerned with material matters.'[122]

Tertullian has successfully struck a balance. He acknowledges that God is concerned with the church's physical well-being and that there is a place for material requests. But he argues that the better understand-

[117] *De oratione* 6.16-19.

[118] *De oratione* 6.14-15, 20-24.

[119] *De oratione* 6.19-20.

[120] *De ieiunio* 15.

[121] Brown (2004), 20.

[122] Brown (2004), 20.

ing of the request for bread is the spiritual. That is, it is a petition to remain in Christ. We also note that Tertullian makes allusion to the bread of the Eucharist. While he is by no means limiting his notion of *spiritual bread* to the Eucharist, he is reminding his catechumens that their imminent reception of that bread constitutes part of their continuance (*perpetuitas*) in Christ.

*F. The Forgiveness of Sins (*De oratione *7)*

1. Summary

Tertullian begins his remarks on the fifth petition by saying that God's generosity in material provision is the same basis upon which the church seeks his mercy.[123] The provision of food is pointless if our sins are not forgiven.[124] Thus, even though Christ was without sin, he taught his followers to pray, 'Pardon us our debts.'[125] Tertullian then refers to the formal act of confession before the church, known as *exomologesis,* a practice which he describes as a recognition of wrongdoing and a form of penitence that is pleasing to God.[126]

He goes on to explain the significance of *debt.* When wrongdoing has occurred, a debt is incurred that can only be satisfied by judgment. Restitution is made by the remission of the debt,[127] as the parable of the servant (Mt. 18:23-35) demonstrates. But the pardoned servant failed to forgive his debtors, and he was subsequently punished. Therefore, 'Our confession that we too "pardon our debtors"' is consonant with that teaching.[128] Jesus had said, 'Forgive and it will be forgiven you.' And he had told Peter to forgive his brother seventy times seven, demonstrating a better form of law than the seven-fold vengeance upon Cain, and the seventy-fold vengeance on Lamech.[129]

[123] *De oratione* 7.1-2.

[124] *De oratione* 7.2-3. Tertullian employs an opaque analogy to make this point: 'For what will food profit us if its reason is to render us a bull for sacrifice.'

[125] *De oratione* 7.4-5. *Dimitti nobis debita nostra* is the same as other cotemporary texts.

[126] *De oratione* 7.5-7. He uses the transliterated Greek term, indicating that it is a formal practice of the church known by this name, as noted by Simpson (1965), 102n.

[127] *De oratione* 7.7-10.

[128] *Eo competit quod remittere nos quoque profitemur debitoribus nostris* (*De oratione* 7.14-15).

[129] *De oratione* 7.16-20.

2. Elucidation

The most notable feature of Tertullian's commentary on the fifth petition is the correlation that he establishes between this petition and *exomologesis,* an exercise of penance that was common in North African churches.[130] The purpose of this practice was to effect a 'temporal mortification' of the flesh that would 'enhance repentance.' In the Carthaginian church, this practice was integral to one's preparation for baptism. Tertullian describes this custom in *De baptismo*:

> They who are about to enter baptism ought to pray with repeated prayers, fasts, and bendings of the knee, and vigils all the night through, and with the confession of all bygone sins ... To us it is matter for thankfulness if we do *now* publicly confess our iniquities or our turpitudes: for we do at the same time both make satisfaction for our former sins, by mortification of our flesh and spirit, and lay beforehand the foundation of defences against the temptations which will closely follow.[131]

In light of the intensity that characterized the period of preparation for baptism, Tertullian no doubt attributed to the fifth petition a sense of finality and consummation. There is no indication, however, that he expects the believer to cease from sin after baptism.[132] Rather, in the passage cited above from *De baptismo,* he remarks that the penance prior to

[130] He describes this process in *De paenitentia* 9: 'And thus *exomologesis* is a discipline for man's prostration and humiliation, enjoining a demeanor calculated to move mercy. With regard also to the very dress and food, it commands (the penitent) to lie in sackcloth and ashes, to cover his body in mourning, to lay his spirit low in sorrows, to exchange for severe treatment the sins which he has committed; moreover, to know no food and drink but such as is plain, — not for the stomach's sake, to wit, but the soul's; for the most part, however, to feed prayers on fastings, to groan, to weep and make outcries unto the Lord your God; to bow before the feet of the presbyters, and kneel to God's dear ones; to enjoin on all the brethren to be ambassadors to bear his deprecatory supplication (before God). All this *exomologesis* (does), that it may enhance repentance; may honour God by its fear of the (incurred) danger; may, by itself pronouncing against the sinner, stand in the stead of God's indignation, and by temporal mortification (I will not say frustrate, but) expunge eternal punishments.'

[131] *De baptismo 20.*

[132] Against Simpson (1965), 102: 'Tertullian apparently believes that sinlessness is an attainable option for Christians, in whom God's powerful will is at work; for the single repentance just noted included both sins of flesh and spirit, of deed and will. If perfection is to be the rule rather than the exception, as it appears to be, what significance can the common confession implied by this petition possess? Tertullian fails to clarify for what sins the Lord's Prayer helps atone. His interpretation suggests no answer, and his other writings add no significant information. Evidently, Tertullian

baptism serves as a defense against the temptations that follow. In other words, he makes allowance for the ongoing struggle with sin. His strong emphasis in *De oratione* 7 on the need to forgive one another is another indication that sin continues to occur within the church. Consequently, the confession of sin which formed part of the LP is not a 'once for all' act, but rather a regular part of the Christian life.

G. *Temptation and the Evil One (*De oratione *8)*

1. Summary

Tertullian asserts that God's intention is not only for Christians to receive forgiveness from sin, but to avoid it altogether.[133] Therefore they are to pray, 'Do not lead us into temptation.'[134] The meaning is this: 'do not allow us so to be led by the one that tempts.'[135] Tertullian acknowledges that this petition gives the impression that God Himself tempts, but he clarifies that this cannot be the case. 'For God is not ignorant of the condition of our faith, nor does he seek to dethrone it. Rather, weakness and malice are of the devil.'[136] The ordeal of Abraham was not a testing of his faith, but rather a demonstration of it,[137] so that Abraham might serve as an illustration of Christ's teaching, that one should not hold his children as more precious than God.[138] Jesus himself was tempted by the Devil, who is 'the leader and worker of temptation.'[139]

It is this understanding which clarifies Jesus' words to his disciples: 'Pray that you be not put to the test.' They were tempted to abandon Christ because, 'they devoted themselves to sleep, rather than to

is compelled to describe such confession merely by the presence of this petition in the Lord's Prayer.'

[133] *De oratione* 8.1-2.

[134] *Ne nos inducas in temtationem.* This rendering differs from Cyprian's text (251 CE) which reads, *Et ne patiaris nos induci in temptationem* ('and do not allow us to be led into temptation'). See notes 51 and 63. Once again we note that Tertullian may have simply been using his own translation from the Greek, which may or may not have coincided with the reciting text of his audience.

[135] *De oratione* 8.3-4.

[136] *De oratione* 8.4-6.

[137] *Nam et Abraham non temptandae fidei gratia sacrificare de filio iusserat, sed probandae* (*De oratione* 8.6-8).

[138] *De oratione* 8.4-9.

[139] De oratione 8.10-11.

prayer.'[140] It is in this light that the petition, 'do not lead us into temptation,' corresponds with the conclusion of the prayer, 'But remove us from the evil one.'[141]

2. Elucidation

In light of our comments in the previous section, we begin by noting that Tertullian's remarks on the final petitions of the LP evince no expectation of sinlessness. God's intends for His children to be righteous. Tertullian nonetheless acknowledges that the ongoing struggle with sin is real.

He grapples with one of the great exegetical challenges of the LP, i.e., how to explain, καὶ μὴ εἰσενέγκῃς ἡμᾶς εἰς πειρασμόν ('lead us not into temptation'). His resolution of this problem is rather cavalier. He begins with a literal translation into Latin, *ne nos inducas in temtationem*, but then he goes on to rephrase it (without grammatical justification) as: *ne nos patiaris induci, ab eo utique qui temptat*, i.e., 'do not allow us to be led by the person who tempts.' The emendation Tertullian employs was so persuasive, that it became broadly embraced by the North African church.[142]

Tertullian bases his interpretation on theological reasoning rather than grammar, and his thoughts on this issue are more thoroughly explained in *De fuga in persecutione.* He there argues that persecution and injustice stem from the Devil, and not from God. God allows persecution as a way of demonstrating faith, but the actual injustice is afflicted through Satan. That is to say, persecution is by the Devil's 'agency' but not by his 'origination.' God's purpose in persecution is that 'righteousness may be perfected in injustice, as strength is perfected in weakness.'[143] Even so, God invites His children to seek His protection from testing. So it is 'that both things belong to God, the shaking of faith as well as the shielding of it, when both are sought from Him — the shaking by the devil, the shielding by the Son.'[144] He then ties these arguments into the final petitions of the LP:

[140] *De oratione* 8.11-13.

[141] *De oratione* 8.13-15.

[142] Cf. Simpson (1965), 63-64, and Stewart-Sykes (2004), 39. Cyprian incorporated Tertullian's explanatory gloss (*De oratione* 8.4) into the actual text of the prayer.

[143] *De fuga in persecutione* 2..

[144] *De fuga in persecutione* 2..

> But in the prayer prescribed to us, when we say to our Father, 'Lead us not into temptation' (now what greater temptation is there than persecution?), we acknowledge that that comes to pass by His will whom we beseech to exempt us from it. For this is what follows, 'But deliver us from the wicked one,' that is, do not lead us into temptation by giving us up to the wicked one, for then are we delivered from the power of the devil, when we are not handed over to him to be tempted.[145]

Tertullian here presents a nuanced argument regarding temptation. First, he establishes that the difficult circumstances which create temptation, such as persecution and injustice, are not wrought by God. Rather, Satan is the author of these maladies. He goes on to acknowledge, however, that periodically God allows Satan to have his way, and God's intention in these cases is good, (i.e. they are for the strengthening of faith). Christians may ask God to be exempt from trial, but he implicitly acknowledges that this will not always be a successful prayer. In spite of one's request to be exempt from testing, times of testing may in fact come by the Lord's allowance. In *De oratione*, he notes that both Abraham and Jesus were subject to trial. Thus it is natural that the believers should expect the same.

This aspect of Tertullian's thought is intriguing, in that he envisions a relationship between God and the believer that is dynamic in character. God periodically allows testing to occur, if He deems it to be beneficial — but He instructs his children to pray that it does not occur. We recall Tertullian's declaration, ***movebitur sed non evertetur***, 'God will be moved, but not subverted.' He will triumph in his objectives, but there are multiple ways of reaching them. In Tertullian's thought-world, men and women are invited to engage God in relationship. He acts and reacts in accordance with what they do, how they think, and how they pray.[146] He invites them to plead with Him and persuade Him, to show Him what is in their heart, so that the testing of their faith may not be necessary.

[145] *De fuga in persecutione* 2.

[146] It is within this same framework that Tertullian defends the notion of God's repentance. In *Adversus Marcionem* 2.24 he argues that sometimes God alters a previously declared course of action as a consequence of human activity. This repentance is simply a change of mind, 'which in God we have shown to be regulated by the occurrence of varying circumstances.'

H. Tertullian's Concluding remarks (De oratione 9, 29)

1. Summary

As he moves into his closing remarks (*De oratione* 9),[147] Tertullian reminds his audience that this brief prayer is a recapitulation not only of the gospel, but of the whole of Scripture: 'How many are the statements of the prophets, gospels, and apostles, the words of the Lord, parables, illustrations, instructions, touched performed on one occasion!'[148] The believer's participation in the LP fulfills numerous functions in the Christian life: the giving of honor, the witness to faith, the offering of obedience, the remembrance of hope, the quest for life, the confession of sin, and the awareness of temptation.[149] God alone could have taught such an efficacious form of prayer.[150]

He then concludes his reflections with a series of remarks on the efficacy of prayer (*De oratione* 29). Because the LP proceeds from the Spirit and the Truth, and because it is God who commanded them to pray as such, God cannot deny its petitions.[151] If prayer had been effective during the time of the previous, inferior covenant, 'How much more effective, then, is the Christian prayer?'[152] In previous times, prayer had brought deliverance from suffering, but now it brings endurance:

> By delegated grace it turns away no feeling of pain, but it arms with endurance those who are suffering and knowing pain and grieving. It increases grace with bravery so that faith might know what it obtains from the Lord, understanding what it is suffering for the sake of the name of the Lord.[153]

In previous times, prayer had brought calamity upon the enemies of Israel. But now prayer seeks mercy for the enemy, and makes supplication for the persecutor.[154] It now brings rain, whereas it once brought

[147] In what would have been Tertullian's oral delivery of this teaching, my position is that De oratione chapters 9 and 29 represent his conclusion, while chapters 10-28 were added to the 'print' version. See note 18.

[148] *De oratione* 9.1-3.

[149] *De oratione* 9.4-7.

[150] *De oratione* 9.7-9.

[151] *De oratione* 29.1-2.

[152] *De oratione* 29.5.

[153] *De oratione* 29.7-11.

[154] *De oratione* 29.12-14.

fire.[155] Prayer alone conquers God.[156] The purpose of prayer is only for the good, and all that it accomplishes is for the good of the church, and the entire world.[157] It is therefore the duty (*officium*) of the Christian to pray, even as the Lord himself prayed.[158]

2. Elucidation

We see in Tertullian's final remarks that the fundamental purpose of the LP is to manifest the goodness of God. *God's goodness* is the driving force of prayer, the gospels, and the whole of Scripture. It is the controlling idea of Tertullian's theology. In his argument against Marcion, he asserts that the LP reveals the righteous character of God: 'For the prayer which He has taught us suits, as we have proved, none but the Creator ... because He is the supremely and spontaneously good God!'[159] Each petition of the prayer tells of his goodness:

> To whom can I say, 'Father?' To him who had nothing to do with making me, from whom I do not derive my origin? Or to Him, who, by making and fashioning me, became my parent? Of whom can I ask for His Holy Spirit? Of him who gives not even the mundane spirit; or of Him 'who maketh His angels spirits,' and whose Spirit it was which in the beginning hovered upon the waters. Whose kingdom shall I wish to come — his, of whom I never heard as the king of glory; or His, in whose hand are even the hearts of kings? Who shall give me my daily bread? Shall it be he who produces for me not a grain of millet-seed; or He who even from heaven gave to His people day by day the bread of angels? Who shall forgive me my trespasses? He who, by refusing to judge them, does not retain them; or He who, unless He forgives them, will retain them, even to His judgment? Who shall suffer us not to be led into temptation? He before whom the tempter will never be able to tremble; or He who from the beginning has beforehand condemned the angel tempter?[160]

[155] *De oratione* 29.14-15. Stewart-Sykes (2004), 63, notes that Tertullian here makes reference to the 'thundering legion,' a group of Christian soldiers who ended a drought by their prayers, as told in *Ad Scapulam* 4.

[156] *Sola est oratio quae deum vincit.*

[157] *De oratione* 29.16-23.

[158] *De oratione* 29.33.

[159] *Adversus Marcionem* 4.36.

[160] *Adversus Marcionem* 4:26. Tertullian based this series of questions not upon his own text of the LP, but that of Marcion. Incidentally, it is unlikely that Maricon's

Tertullian views prayer as an invitation extended to God asking Him to make His goodness manifest on earth. God would be just in punishing His enemies and judging sin, but the Christian prayer is a means of 'conquering God.' It stays His wrath and draws in His mercy, as Tertullian has noted in the *Apologeticus*:

> If we compare the calamities of former times, they fall on us more lightly now, since God gave Christians to the world; for from that time virtue put some restraint on the world's wickedness, and men began to pray for the averting of God's wrath ... We, dried up with fastings, and our passions bound tightly up, holding back as long as possible from all the ordinary enjoyments of life, rolling in sackcloth and ashes, assail heaven with our importunities — touch God's heart.[161]

Prayer is, for Tertullian, a duty, an *officium* — because it the mechanism that God has ordained to accomplish His purposes. In sum, God is infinitely good. But in order for the goodness of God to be fully revealed on earth, the people of God on earth must pray.

IV. Conclusion

Quintus Septimus Florens Tertullianus was an apologist. His passion was to explain and defend the Christian faith, and to demonstrate its innate rationality. In this endeavor he sought to engage the pagans who failed to understand the Faith, the 'heretics' who distorted it, the Jews who disagreed with it, and the Christians who needed to grasp its depth and its beauty. He was an apologist not only to those outside the church, but to those within it as well. His zeal to defend the church from without was matched by his passion to strengthen it from within.

The exegesis of the LP in *De oratione* is essentially a persuasive speech. Tertullian deeply believed in the fundamental *goodness* of the Christian God, and in his instruction he was calling these Carthaginian baptismal candidates to pray, to think and to live in such a way that was worthy of his God. Tertullian was a moralist. His ethical standard was rigid, and lofty — but this does not derive from a deficient understanding of the Christian doctrine of grace. Tertullian's ethical standard was driven by

text read 'let your Holy Spirit come upon us and cleanse us,' as many have suggested. See Roth (2012), and Carruth & Garsky (1996), 4-18.

[161] *Apologeticus* 40.

his sense of *pietas*, the responsibility that flows from relationship. And it was driven by his sense of *officium*, or duty, because he believed that there is a *right way* to serve the true God.

Modern scholars often characterize Tertullian in an unsavory fashion. Geoffrey Dunn, for example, remarks that Tertullian

> had the enthusiasm and zeal of a fanatic, the rigour and clarity of the recently converted, and the intolerance and righteousness of the self-assured. He was a partisan and an extremist. Nothing less than perfection was the requirement for being his kind of Christian and, for him, there could be no other kind.[162]

This evaluation is unduly harsh.

We have seen here a more nuanced, and more appealing aspect of Tertullian's thought. He believed that the goodness of God was manifest in the creation of man, that God had bestowed on man a high capacity for reason, and absolute freedom. Tertullian's God could accomplish His purposes among the human race without the need for coercion or control. His God invited women and men into dynamic relationship. He listened to them, He wrestled with them and He took their pleas into account. Prayer, for Tertullian, was not a process of *personal alignment* to fate; it was a truly an invitation to participate with God in shaping the course of human history.

As we ponder the various sources of influence that may have shaped Tertullian's worldview, the influence of Stoicism is particularly intriguing. There has been a renewed interest in recent scholarship with regard to the influence of Stoicism upon early Christianity,[163] and Tertullian is a prime candidate for study. Even as he adamantly disavowed Stoic thought,[164] he employed it consistently in his arguments. Osborn explains this phenomenon in the following terms:

[162] Dunn (2004), 10.

[163] e.g., Colish (1990), 9-29, offers an in-depth analysis of Tertullian's attitude toward Stoicism, and Rasimus, Engberg-Pedersen,& Dunderberg (eds)(2010) contains a series of articles that explore the broad influence of Stoic thought on early Christianity.

[164] His most famous remarks in this regard are found in *De praescriptione haereticorum* 7: 'What indeed has Athens to do with Jerusalem? What concord is there between the Academy and the Church? what between heretics and Christians? Our instruction comes from "the porch of Solomon," who had himself taught that "the Lord should be sought in simplicity of heart." Away with all attempts to produce a mottled Christianity of Stoic, Platonic, and dialectic composition! We want no curious disputation after possessing Christ Jesus, no inquisition after enjoying the gospel! With our

> To a remarkable extent, Tertullian respected conventional rhetorical forms which made his work more accessible to his contemporaries. Tertullian faced a complex situation, where the culture of Greece and Rome, the religion of Israel and the new faith in Jesus came together in a mixture of conflict and agreement. Each component had internal diversity within which Tertullian had to choose.[165]

It would not be entirely accurate, however, to describe Tertullian as *eclectic*, for he did not consciously *choose* his ideas from these various thought systems. Engberg-Pedersen explains:

> Instead of speaking of 'eclecticism' (as if philosophers just picked up a little from here and there as they saw fit and with no systematic concerns), and instead of speaking of 'syncretism' (as if philosophers sought to meld together different philosophies into a single blend), we should speak of the underlying philosophical strategy during the Transitional Period as being one of 'absorption' into one's own preferred philosophy of alien ideas that one claimed to be actually one's own.[166]

Thus, the most apt explanation might be to say that Tertullian had *absorbed* elements of Greco-Roman philosophy, Carthaginian culture, Jewish thought, and the message of the NT. There is no doubt that the modern reader can identify various elements of his arguments as flowing from *this* thought system or *that*. But Tertullian himself would have been very limited in this capacity, as his ambivalence toward Stoicism clearly demonstrates.[167]

Returning to the metaphor of *absorption*, we may say that Tertullian had a certain capacity to assimilate *foreign* ideas. His interpretation of the LP in many ways conveys a continuity in relation to the message of Jesus. The notions of *Fatherhood, obedience, faith,* and *forgiveness* are explicated in a manner broadly consistent with how a first-century Palestinian Jew would have understood them. But in other ways, we might say that even when he came to faith, much of his worldview had already

faith, we desire no further belief. For this is our palmary faith, that there is nothing which we ought to believe besides.'

165 Osborn (1997), 7.

166 Engberg-Pedersen (2010), 8. The 'Transitional Period' refers to 100 BCE-200 CE, and it characterized by an early predominance of Stoicism that was subsequently overtaken by Platonism.

167 We bear in mind that no author in an urban, literate climate can stand completely outside of the philosophical currents that are predominant in his or her culture.

been formed. The Latin language, Stoic philosophy, and Greco-Roman culture had left their mark, and a complete break from these influences was impossible. Hence, such notions as the 'harmony of opposites,' *pietas, officium*, and 'life according to nature' also shaped his understanding of this prayer. Hence, we may conclude that neither a diachronic nor a synchronic theory of hermeneutics will alone do justice to Tertullian's thought. He was both an innovator and a product of his culture.

CONCLUSION

I. The Interpretation of a Text

To understand the Lord's Prayer is to take note of the experience in which it originated, and the history in which it has been encountered.[1] The meaning of this prayer is not something that can be pinpointed to a fixed moment in the past. Even as the words may remain the same, the lived response to this prayer is an ever-unfolding story. The original sense of this prayer is embedded in the life and proclamation of Jesus Christ. Insomuch as this text is acknowledged as *his* prayer, there exists a directionality to its meaning, and parameters within which it can be understood. Yet, as a prayer, the LP is a living text. It allows — even urges — a freedom of interpretation.

When Jesus first taught this prayer to his Jewish followers, he implemented historically transmitted metaphors, scriptural allusions, and cultural symbols within new contexts and with new associations. Utilizing immanently familiar words and terminologies, he created a prayer that was, in essence, *new*. As the LP was subsequently transmitted by his disciples, its *history of effects* took shape. Just as Jesus' teaching on the LP reflected his interpretation of Judaism, so *their* teaching on the LP reflected *their* interpretation of Jesus. Writing within a unique *Sitz im Leben* and presenting the LP within a literary context of their own mak-

[1] Luz, (2005), 275, notes: 'Understanding the texts means taking note of the experiences they originate in, comprehending the reality they reflect, and listening to the fundamental history to which they refer. One way or the other, understanding biblical texts means dealing with history. In contrast to the widespread current idea that the historical is, in the end, relative and therefore secondary, we must say that for biblical texts the history to which they refer and which they reflect is primary'

ing, they created new allusions and associations for the LP that opened the door for new meanings and applications.

II. History of Effects

A. A Jewish Prayer

The LP was born within the Jewish experience of first-century Palestine. It was a time of religious upheaval. Many Jews were frustrated with 'the system.' Some had completely broken away from the priestly hierarchy operating out of the Jerusalem Temple. Others accepted the priesthood and participated in the sacrifices, even as they were searching for a deeper level of encounter with their God. The perceived weakness of the priestly system was that it created a barrier between the people and YHWH. The experience of the divine glory was limited to the confines of the Temple where the priests owned the ritual. They said the prayers and offered the sacrifices, while the common people were relegated to the role of bystanders.

In this setting, a movement took shape to expand the holiness of the Temple into the home, the village and the synagogue. The notion was that every man could experience the presence of God and share in the holiness of the priests. Many Jews were beginning to see the community itself as the dwelling place of God. The synagogues where they gathered were seen as replications of the Jerusalem sanctuary. And the offering they lifted up was the sacrifice of prayer. This mystical act of entering into communion with God through the verbal declaration of one's faith, needs and aspirations was becoming the new focal point of first-century Judaism. This was the setting in which Jesus taught his followers to pray, 'Our Father in heaven ...'.

In the particular words that he used to craft this prayer, there was nothing new or radical. Jews had long conceived of YHWH as a Father. The sanctification of His name, the establishment of His rule on earth, and the supremacy of His will were all themes that had been expressed in Jewish prayer for many years. Dependence on YHWH for material needs, the acknowledgement of one's sin, the need to forgive others, victory over temptation and Satan were also 'well-worn' motifs in Jewish thought and prayer.

What made this prayer unique — even revolutionary — on the lips of Jesus was its character as a prayer of fulfillment. Jesus presented the

LP a prayer of covenant renewal. Israel had failed to honor her calling as a particular, chosen people. Consequently, the hope that Israel's God would be universally worshiped failed to materialize. Jesus came to restore Israel to her original calling and destiny. He had kept the Deuteronomic covenant on her behalf. The LP was his invitation to join him, and become the community of Covenant fulfillment.

Subsequent to the death and resurrection of Jesus, the early Christian communities integrated the recitation of the LP into their daily discipline of prayer. As the teachings of Jesus were transmitted orally, his instruction on prayer was a central element of the tradition. Yet, just as Jesus had presented historical Judaism in a manner that reflected his unique perspective, so early Christian portrayals of Jesus were varied and dynamic.

The latter part of the first century brought a wave of texts in which these unique interpretations were presented, namely, the Gospels of Matthew and Luke, and the *Didache*. To a significant degree, each of these texts built upon the foundation which Jesus had established. The notions of prayer *as sacrifice, community as Temple,* and covenant fulfillment were now commonplace in Christian thought.[2] The fundamental significance of the LP's vocabulary remained intact. Yet each of these interpreters created innovatory significance, forms and functions for the simple prayer that Jesus had once articulated.

B. *Matthew*

The first known interpreter of this prayer was Matthew. This Gospel author believed that through the LP, the church exercised an authority that would alter the cosmological order. The unnatural separation and tension between the realms of heaven and earth were dissipating as the *ecclesia* proclaimed, 'on earth as it is in heaven.' Matthew saw this prayer as a potent instrument of warfare, which strengthened the resolve of Christians to live in moral uprightness, even as it moved the hand of God to defeat the powers of evil in the heavenly realm. It was a prayer for ethical righteousness rooted in eschatological vision.

Matthew sought to emphasize the cosmological implications of this prayer. His reading of the LP was eschatological in the sense that it envisioned the coming union of heaven and earth. Yet it was not 'futuristic

[2] See, for example: 1 Cor 3:16-17; Eph 2:19-21; Rom 12:1; 1 Pet 2:5; Heb 13:5; 2 Cor 3:6; Heb 7:22.

in the sense that the realization of its petitions would be delayed.[3] He saw this as a prayer that had immediate consequences. The kingdom was a present reality, and the prayers of the church were essential to the expansion that would ultimately lead to its consummation on earth.

The genius of Matthew was his ability to convey what the LP meant upon the lips of Jesus, even as he crafted an interpretation of his own. In the proclamation of Jesus, the LP was rooted in the history and theology of Israel. It evoked images of Israel in Sinai, her particularity among the nations, and the supremacy of her God. Matthew faithfully transmitted this tradition. Yet, he also gave new meaning to this prayer. A text rooted in narrative theology became a treatise on the cosmological order.

C. The Didache

The lofty theology evinced in Matthew's presentation of the LP stands in contrast to the practical character of another first-century document, the *Didache.* For the communities that used this text, the value of the LP was to be found in its effectiveness for community discipleship. These believers aspired to walk upon the Deuteronomic Way of Life. In their quest for sanctification, however, they had to deal with the messiness of everyday life. Their fellowships were the 'wild west' of early Christianity. The structured discipline that some of them had once enjoyed as members of the synagogue was now being overrun by a horde of formerly-pagan converts. The outpouring of the Spirit had left in its wake a new order of wandering apostles and prophets, for whom the 'rules of conduct' were just beginning to take shape.

Amidst this struggle between order and chaos, the thrice-daily repetition of the LP served to keep the communities aligned on the path toward sanctification. Theirs was a 'spirituality of the road,' one which recognized that perfection would not come all-at-once. The LP was a prayer that validated their identity as a community grounded in grace. It directed their attention toward the final goal, even as it reiterated the everyday values that would enable them to stay on the Way of Life.

[3] The characterization of the LP as an 'eschatological' prayer often connotes futuristic fulfillment. That is to say, the LP looks to a future, all-at-once granting of the kingdom, forgiveness, deliverance from evil, etc. Such is the view of Brown (1968), Jeremias (1978), Lohmeyer (1965), and Milavec (2003). I have argued throughout this work that many of these early interpreters looked toward an immediate realization of their petitions. My particular view, however, is that the LP is 'eschatological' in the sense that it points to God's activities to fulfill His promises and purposes in the final era of history which Jesus inaugurated.

D. Luke

Whereas Matthew and the *Didache* presented the LP within the framework of first-century Judaism, Luke's objective was to transmit this prayer across geographical and cultural boundaries. The Christian movement had advanced beyond the small villages of Palestine, and was now taking root in the cosmopolitan poleis of the Roman Empire. The cultural and geographical setting in which the disciples had first learned the LP was unfamiliar to the readers of Luke's narrative. In order to convey the meaning of this prayer, he needed to create a frame of reference that was internal to his text. Consequently, the meaning of every word and petition of the LP was demonstrated in the lives of his characters. Those words and concepts which he could not unequivocally 'flesh out' in his narrative were trimmed from the text. The result was a form of the LP that was concise, robust, and immediately applicable.

Luke-Acts was written with an agenda. Luke's vision was that the spectacular expansion of the Christian faith would continue into the next generation. Having told the story of the *Heilsgeschichte*, he intended for his readers to write the next chapter. Luke sought to demonstrate that prayer had been the driving force behind the successes of the past. The era of 'answered prayer' had been inaugurated. Jesus, the disciples and the early church had all been deeply committed to the practice of prayer, and he urged his audience to follow their example.

Luke presented the LP as a simple text that was rich in meaning. It was a missionary prayer that envisioned a Spirit-empowered church boldly proclaiming the kingdom. Yet it was also a prayer about the relationships that would be essential to the church's continued health and expansion. The communities of faith needed to walk in dependence upon, and intimacy with the Father. They needed to share with one another, practice forgiveness, and spur one another on to perseverance in their missionary calling. As they prayed this prayer and implemented its ethos into their daily praxis, they could be assured that God would work through them to advance His kingdom on the earth.

E. Tertullian

As the first century came to an end, textual interpretation of the LP[4] entered into a hiatus. More than one hundred years passed before this topic would be treated anew, and it was the Carthaginian *senior* Tertul-

[4] i.e., of which we know.

lian who applied himself to this task. By the year 200, the world, and the church had dramatically changed. The 'parting of the ways' was essentially complete. Christian doctrine was becoming increasingly untethered from its Jewish roots, and was adopting a more Hellenistic flavor in its structure and content. Many elements of the Judaic symbolic universe had now been 'lost in translation.'

Tertullian's presentation of the LP is emblematic of the transformation that had taken place in Christian thought. For him, the LP was a 'new form' and a 'new prayer.' The Jewish imagery and metaphors that it had once evoked were not of primary importance to him. His aim was to present the LP within the framework of a philosophical theology governed by reason and ordering principles. Tertullian was an apologist to the church. He sought to present this prayer in a manner that would be rational and coherent to Christians in a Greco-Roman context. In order to accomplish this objective, Tertullian (at times unconsciously) drew upon the Stoicism of his intellectual formation. He presented the LP as the rational articulation of Jesus the *Logos*, the organizing principle of the universe. It was an operative instrument of God's reason (*dei ratio*), whose purpose was to make manifest the goodness of the Christian God. In the economy of Creation, God had ordained prayer as a mechanism for the accomplishment of His purposes. As the perfect prayer, and as the summary of the gospel, no prayer could accomplish this task more effectively than the LP.

Despite Tertullian's cultural leanings, the voice of the Jewish teacher Jesus still resonated in his words. His work bore witness to the tenacity of the LP's themes, and the innate capacity of its symbols to be reincarnated in new cultures, languages, and historical settings. Tertullian demonstrated that this prayer appealed to a common experience of humanity. Goodness, evil, honor, forgiveness, and struggle were themes unconstrained by time and culture. The Jewish fishermen of first-century Galilee and the catechumens of third-century Carthage were not so different after all.

III. Hermeneutical Conclusions

At the outset of this work, I stated that the challenge in surveying the LP's *history of effects* is to not simply document change and continuity, but to explain *why*. We have approached the LP via the hermeneutical integration of diachronic and synchronic methodologies. Our basic

premise has been that innovative communication is possible, even as it remains dependent upon inherited language, forms and conventions. We now evaluate what has our study has revealed to us about the nature of *diachronic creativity* and its counterpart *synchronic continuity*.

In consideration of the former, my conclusion is that the power of innovation lies with the communicator himself. The process by which our various authors conveyed their understanding of the LP can be compared to the artistic framing of a painting: A wooden border crops the image, highlighting certain features while muting others. It creates either a synthesis or contrast of colors. The frame may not necessarily alter the painting itself, but it does determine how the image is perceived. Applying this illustration to the transmission of the LP, we recognize that standing alone, in an 'unframed' state, the words and imagery of this prayer had the potential to convey numerous significations. The creation of context gave each author the power to communicate a message largely of his own determination. Inherited symbols could be given new meaning when the communicator had the will and the skill to do so.

Jesus took imagery and symbols that were familiar to the Jews of first-century Palestine, and tied their meaning to his own life and proclamation. Embedded in his own personal narrative, these historical symbols took on new significance. Matthew created new meaning for the LP's symbols primarily by means of the literary and theological context with which he surrounded the prayer. The *Didache*'s presentation of the LP was shaped by the discipleship ethos of the community. Luke created meaning for the LP by means of associations with the characters and events in his narrative. Tertullian conveyed new significations for this prayer by means of its integration into the thought world of Greco-Roman culture. In each case, innovational meaning came by the intent of the author. We therefore may affirm the diachronic intuition that man is the creator of meaning.

We must also account, however, for the continuity that has been observed in the interpretative history of the LP. Our survey has shown that this prayer could signify many things, but that there were boundaries of meaning which all of our interpreters seemed to honor. It is my conclusion that this power of continuity is attributable to the fact that this prayer was consistently associated with the life and proclamation of Jesus Christ. In the midst of new understandings and applications, it never ceased to be the prayer that Jesus had spoken. Each interpreter viewed it as a core element of the Jesus tradition, and each recognized its central role in the life of the community. As long as its words were

acknowledged as *his* words; and as long as it remained the prayer of *his* church, it could mean many things, but it could not mean *anything*. We thus find affirmation for the synchronic notion that, to some extent, meaning is imposed upon man.[5]

In conclusion, I echo the statement with which I opened this work: The understanding of the Lord's Prayer emerges from the history of its understanding. We have viewed this prayer in the earliest stages of its encounter, the period which is the foundation of a long history of use and interpretation. In this endeavor, we have not 'uncovered' the meaning of the LP. That is a work still in progress, as Gadamer reminds us: 'The discovery of the true meaning of a text or a work of art is never finished.'[6] We have glimpsed at what this prayer meant to different people at different times. Their experience matters to the millions of people who continue to pray the LP today. For what it means to us is, in part, the consequence of their experience. We are the heirs of their legacy, even as we are participants with them in giving shape to what the Lord's Prayer will mean to future generations.

[5] This is to say that as long as the authors chose to associate this prayer with the Jesus of the Gospels, meaning was imposed on them. The synchronic continuity we have observed in the interpretations of the LP is primarily attributable to the authorial choice to respect the parameters of meaning that they inherited. They (or anyone) had the ability to do otherwise. I therefore conclude that diachronic creativity is a more powerful dynamic than synchronic continuity.

[6] Gadamer (1989), 298.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. Primary Literature

A. Biblical Translations and the Apocrypha

(1995) *The Apocrypha: King James Version*, Bellingham, WA.
(1997) *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia: SESB*, Stuttgart.
(2001) *The Holy Bible: English Standard Version*, Wheaton, IL.
(1989) *The Holy Bible: New Revised Standard Version*, Nashville.
(1993) *Novum Testamentum Graece*, Stuttgart.
(1996) *Septuaginta*, Stuttgart.

B. The Dead Sea Scrolls

Garcìa Martìnez, F., E. J. Tigchelaar, (1998) *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition,* [translations; vol. 2], Leiden.
Vermes, G., (2004) *The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls in English,* [[1]1980], London.
Wise, M. O., M. G. Abegg, E. Cook, (2005) *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A New Translation*, [[1]1996], San Francisco.

C. Pseudepigrapha and Hellenistic Jewish Literature

Charlesworth, J. H. (ed.), (2009) *The Old Testament Pseudepigrpaha,* [[1]1983], London and New Haven.
Josephus, (1996) *'Antiquitates judaicae,'* [in *The Works of Josephus: Complete and Unabridged*; W. Whiston (trans.); [1]1905], Peabody, MA.
Philo, (2006) *The Works of Philo* [C. D. Yonge (trans.); [1] 1991], Peabody, MA.

D. *The* Didache

Holmes, M. W., (2007) '*The Didache*,' [in M. W. Holmes, *The Apostolic Fathers: Greek Texts and English Translations;* [1]1999], Grand Rapids, MI.
O'Loughlin, T., (2010) *The Didache: A Window on the Earliest Christians*, London.

E. Rabbinic Literature and Ancient Jewish Prayer

Neusner, J. (ed.), (1988) *The Mishnah: A New Translation,* [[1]1988], London and New Haven.
Heinemann, J., J. J. Petuchowski, (eds), (1975) *Literature of the Synagogue*, New York.
Horst, P. W. van der; J. H. Newman, (2008) *Early Jewish Prayers in Greek,* Berlin.
Petuchowski, J. J., (1978a) 'Jewish Prayer Texts of the Rabbinic Period,' [in Petuchowski, J. J., M. Brocke (eds), *The Lord's Prayer and Jewish Liturgy*; 21-44], New York.

F. Greco-Roman Literature

Plato, *The Republic* (1980) [Jowett, B. (trans.); [1] 1870], Norwalk, CT.
Epictetus, (2008) '*Diatribi*,' [in Inwood, B., L. Gerson (trans.), *The Stoics Reader: Selected Writings and Testimonia*; 195-205], Indianapolis, IN.
Inwood, B., L. Gerson, (trans.) (2008), *The Stoics Reader: Selected Writings and Testimonia.* Indianapolis, IN.

G. Ancient Prayers (General)

Kiley, M., et al. (eds), (1997) *Prayer from Alexander to Constantine: A Critical Anthology*, London and New York.

H. Patristic Literature

Clement of Alexandria, (1885) '*Paedagogus*,' [in Roberts, A., J. Donaldson, A. Coxe (eds), *The Ante-Nicene Fathers, Volume II: Fathers of the Second Century: Hermas, Tatian, Athenagoras, Theophilus, and Clement of Alexandria*; 209-298], Buffalo, NY.
Clement of Alexandria, (1885) '*Protrepticus*' [in Roberts, A., J. Donaldson, A. Coxe (eds), *The Ante-Nicene Fathers, Volume II: Fathers of the Second Century: Hermas, Tatian, Athenagoras, Theophilus, and Clement of Alexandria*; 171-206], Buffalo, NY.

Hippolytus, (1934) *Traditio apostolica*, [Easton, B. S., (trans.)], Cambridge.
Ignatius, (2007) 'The Letters of Ignatius,' [in Holmes, M. W., *The Apostolic Fathers: Greek Texts and English Translations*; 182-271; [1]1999], Grand Rapids, MI.
Justin Martyr, (1885) '*Apologia ii*,' [in Roberts, A., J. Donaldson, A. Coxe (eds), *The Ante-Nicene Fathers, Volume 1: The Apostolic Fathers with Justin Martyr and Irenaeus*; 188-193], Buffalo, NY.
Tatian, (1885) '*Oratio ad Graecos*,' [in Roberts, A., J. Donaldson, A. Coxe (eds), *The Ante-Nicene Fathers, Volume II: Fathers of the Second Century: Hermas, Tatian, Athenagoras, Theophilus, and Clement of Alexandria*; 59-83], Buffalo, NY.
Tertullian, (1885) '*Adversus Judaeos*,' [in Roberts, A., J. Donaldson, A. C. Coxe (eds), *The Ante-Nicene Fathers, Volume III: Latin Christianity: Its Founder, Tertullian;* 151-180], Buffalo, NY.
—, (1885) '*Adversus Marcionem,*' [in Roberts, A., J. Donaldson, A. C. Coxe (eds), *The Ante-Nicene Fathers, Volume III: Latin Christianity: Its Founder, Tertullian*; 271-473], Buffalo, NY.
—, (1885) '*Apologeticus*,' [in Roberts, A., D. James, A. C. Coxe (eds), *The Ante-Nicene Fathers, Volume III: Latin Christianity: Its Founder, Tertullian;* 17-55], Buffalo, NY.
—, (1885) '*De baptismo,*' [in Roberts, A., J. Donaldson, A. C. Coxe (eds), *The Ante-Nicene Fathers, Volume III: Latin Christianity: Its Founder, Tertullian*; 669-679], Buffalo, NY.
—, (1964) '*De baptismo*,' [in Evans, E., *Tertullian's Homily on Baptism*], London.
—, (1885) '*De exhortatione castitatis*,' [in Roberts, A., J. Donaldson, A. C. Coxe (eds), *The Ante-Nicene Fathers, Volume IV: Fathers of the Third Century; Tertullian, Part Fourth; Minucius Felix; Commodian; Origen, Parts First and Second*; 50-58], Buffalo, NY.
—, (1885) '*De fuga in persecutione*,' [in Roberts, A., J. Donaldson, A. C. Coxe (eds), *The Ante-Nicene Fathers, Volume IV: Fathers of the Third Century; Tertullian, Part Fourth; Minucius Felix; Commodian; Origen, Parts First and Second*; 116-124], Buffalo, NY.
—, (1885) '*De ieiunio*,' [in A. Roberts, J. Donaldson, A. C. Coxe (eds), *The Ante-Nicene Fathers, Volume IV: Fathers of the Third Century;Tertullian, Part Fourth; Minucius Felix; Commodian; Origen, Parts First and Second*; S. Thelwall (trans.)], Buffalo, NY.
—, (1953) '*De oratione*,' [in Evans, E., *Tertullian's Tract on the Prayer: The Latin Text with Critical Notes, an English Translation, and Introduction, and Explanatory Observations*], London.

—, (2004) '*De oratione*,' [in Stewart-Sykes, A., *Tertullian, Cyprian, Origen: On the Lord's Prayer*], Crestwood, NY.

—, (1885) '*De praescriptione haereticorum*,' [in Roberts, A., J. Donaldson, A. C. Coxe (eds), *The Ante-Nicene Fathers, Volume III: Latin Christianity: Its Founder, Tertullian*; 242-264], Buffalo, NY.

Theophilus of Antioch, (1885) '*Ad Autolycum*,' [in Roberts, A., J. Donaldson, A. Coxe (eds), *The Ante-Nicene Fathers, Volume II: Fathers of the Second Century: Hermas, Tatian, Athenagoras, Theophilus, and Clement of Alexandria*; 89-121], Buffalo, NY.

II. Reference Works and Exegetical Aids

Arndt, W., F. W. Danker, W. Bauer, (2000) *A Greek-English lexicon of the New Testament and other early Christian literature*, [1 1957], Chicago.

Harris, R. L., G. L. Archer, G. L., Jr., B. K. Waltke (eds), (1999) *Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament*, [1 1981] Chicago.

Kittel, G., G. Friedrich, G. W. Bromiley, (1985) *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, Grand Rapids, MI.

Liddell, H., (1996) *A lexicon: Abridged from Liddell and Scott's Greek-English lexicon*, [1 1879] Oak Harbor, WA.

Lust, J., E. Eynikel, K. Hauspie, (2003) *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint*, [1 1992], Stuttgart.

Metzger, B. M., (2002) *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*, [1 1971], Stuttgart.

Newman, B. M., Jr., (1993) *A Concise Greek-English Dictionary of the New Testament*, [1 1971], Stuttgart.

Strong, J., (1995) *Enhanced Strong's Lexicon*, Bellingham, WA.

Whitaker, W., (ed.), (1906) *The Abridged Brown-Driver-Briggs Hebrew-English Lexicon of the Old Testament: From A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament by Francis Brown, S. R. Driver and Charles Briggs, based on the lexicon of Wilhelm Gesenius*, Boston.

III. Secondary Literature

Allison, D. C., (1987) 'The Structure of the Sermon on the Mount,' *Journal of Biblical Literature, 106* (3), 423-445.

Alon, G., (1996) 'The Halacha in the Teaching of the Twleve Apostles,' [in Draper, J. A., (ed.), *The Didache in Modern Research;* 165-194], Leiden.

Attridge, H. W., (2010) 'An "Emotional" Jesus and Stoic Tradition,' [in Rasimus, T., T. Engberg-Pederson, I. Dunderberg (eds), *Stoicism in Early Christianity*; 77-92], Grand Rapids, MI.

Audet, J.-P., (1996) 'Literary and Doctrinal Affinities of the the "Manual of Discipline,"' [in Draper, J. A. (ed.), *The Didache in Modern Research; 130-147*], Leiden.

Ayo, N., (1992) *The Lord's Prayer: A Survey Theological and Literary*, Notre Dame, IN.

Bahr, G. J., (1965) 'The Use of the Lord's Prayer in the Primitive Church,' *Journal of Biblical Literature, 84*(2), 153-159.

Baltzly, D., (2010) 'Stoicism,' *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philoposphy* [Zalta E. N. (ed.); URL = http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/stoicism].

Barnes, T., (1971) *Tertullian: A Historical and Literary Study*, London.

Barrett, C., (1961) *The New Testament Background: Selected Documents*, [[1]1957] London.

Barton, T., (1994) *Ancient Astrology*, London.

Bauckham, R. (ed.), (1998) *The Gospel For All Christians,* Grand Rapids, MI.

Berger, P., (1967) *The Sacred Canopy:Elements of a Sociological Theory of Religion*, New York.

Betz, H. D., (1985) *Essays on the Sermon on the Mount*, Philadelphia.

Betz, J., (1996) 'The Eucharist in the Didache,' [in Draper, J. A. (ed.), *The Didache in Modern Research*; 244-276], Leiden.

Binder, D. D., (1999) *Into the Temple Courts The Place of the Synagogues in the Second Temple Period*, [[1]1997] Atlanta.

Bockmuehl, M., (2006) *Seeing the Word: Refocusing New Testament Study*, Grand Rapids, MI.

Bovon, F., (2006) *Luke the Theologian: Fifty Years of Research* (1955-2005), Waco, TX.

Bradshaw, P. F., (1992) *The Search for the Origins of Christian Worship: Sources And Methods For The Study Of Early Liturgy*, [[1]1992] New York.

Brawley, R., (1987) *Luke-Acts and the Jews: Conflict, Apology and Conciliation*, Atlanta.

Bray, G. L., (1979) *Holiness and the Will of God: Perspectives of the Theology of Tertullian*, Atlanta.

Broadhead, E. K., (2007) 'Jesus and the Priests of Israel,' [in Holmen, T. (ed.), *Jesus from Judaism to Christianity: Continuum Approaches to the Historical Jesus;* 125-144], London.

Brocke, M., J. J. Petuchowski (eds), (1978) *The Lord's Prayer and Jewish Liturgy,* New York.

Brown, M. J., (2000) '"Panem Nostrum": The Problem of Petition in the Lord's Prayer,' *The Journal of Religion, 80*(4), 595-614.

Brown, M. J., (2004) *The Lord's Prayer Through North African Eyes,* New York.

Brown, R., (1968) *New Testament Essays,* [[1]1965], Garden City, NY.

Buch-Hansen, G., (2010) *It is the Spirit that Gives Life: A Stoic Understanding of the Spirit in John's Gospel*, Berlin.

Bultmann, R., (1955) 'The Transformation of the Idea of the Church in the History of Early Christianity,' *Canadian Journal of Theology*(1), 73-81.

Burthchaell, J. T., (1992) *From Synagogue to Church,* Cambridge.

Burton, E. D., (1896) 'The Ancient Synagogue Service,' *The Biblical World, 8*(2), 143-148.

—, (1900) 'The Purpose and Plan of the Gospel Luke,' *The Biblical World, 16*(4), 248-258.

Byargeon, R. W., (1998) 'Echoes of Wisdom in the Lord's Prayer (Matt 6:9-13),' *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society 41*(3), 353-365.

Cabaniss, A., (1943) 'Liturgy-Making Factors in Primitive Christianity,' *The Journal of Religion, 23*(1), 43-58.

Cadbury, H. J., (1964) 'Acts and Eschatology,' [in Davies, W., D. Daube (eds), *The Background of the New Testament and its Eschatology: Studies in Honor of C. H. Dodd;* 300-321], Cambridge.

Carruth, S., A. Garsky, (1996) *Documenta Q: Reconstuctions of Q Through Two Centuries of Gospel Research* (Vols Q 11:2b-4), Leuven.

Catto, S., (2007) *Reconstructing the First-Century Synagogue*, London.

Chadwick, H., (2001) *The Church in Ancient Society*, Oxford.

Charlesworth, J. H., (1988) *Jesus Within Judaism: New Light from Exciting Archaeological Discoveries*, New York.

—, (1993) 'Jewish Prayers in the Time of Jesus,' [in Migliore, D. L. (ed.), *The Lord's Prayer: Perspectives for Reclaiming Christian Prayer;* 36-55], Grand Rapids.

Charlesworth, J. H., M. Harding, (1994) *The Lord's Prayer And Other Prayer Texts From The Greco Roman Era*, Valley Forge, PA.

Chase, F. H., (2004) *The Lord's Prayer in the Early Church,* [[1]1891], Eugene, OR.

Chazon, E. G., (1992) 'Is Divrei ha-mer'rot a Sectarian Prayer?,' [in Dimant, D., U. Rappaport (eds) *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Forty Years of Research;* 3-17], Jerusalem.

—, (1994) 'Prayers from Qumran and Their Historical Implications,' *Dead Sea Discoveries, 1*(3), 265-284.

Cochrane, C. N., (1970) *Christianity and Classical Culture*, New York.

Colish, M. L., (1990) *The Stoic Tradition From Antiquity to the Early Middle Ages: Stoicism in Christian Latin Thought through the Sixth Century*, [vol. 2; [1]1985], Leiden.

Collins, J. J., (2010) *Beyond the Qumran Community,* Grand Rapids.

Conn, H. M., (1972) 'Luke's Theology of Prayer,' *Christianity Today, 17*, 290-292.

Conzelmann, H., (1960) *The Theology of St Luke,* London.

—, (1980) 'Luke's Place in the Development of Early Christianity,' [in Keck, L. E., J. L. Martyn (eds), *Studies in Luke-Acts*; [1]1966], Philadelphia.

Cross, F. M., (1973) *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic: Essays in the History of the Religion of Israel*, Cambridge, MA.

—, (1995) *The Ancient Library of Qumran*, Sheffield.

Crossan, J. D., (2010) *The Greatest Prayer: Rediscovering the Revolutionary Message of the Lord's Prayer*, New York.

Crump, D., (1992) *Jesus the Intercessor: Prayer and Christology in Luke-Acts*, Tubingen.

Daley, B. E., (1991) *The Hope of the Early Church: A Handbook of Patristic Eschatology*, Cambridge.

de Boer, M. C., (1999) 'Paul and Apocalyptic Eschatology,' [in Collins, J. J., B. McGinn (eds), *The Encyclopedia of Apocalypticism;* vol. *1;* 345-383], New York.

de Silva, D. A., (2000) *Honor, Patronage, Kinship & Purity: Unlocking New Testament Culture*, Downers Grove, IL.

Decret, F., (2009) *Early Christianity in North Africa,* [Smither, E. L. (trans.)], Eugene, OR.

Deissler, A., (1978) 'The Spirit of the Lord's Prayer in the Faith and Worship of the Old Testament,' [in Petuchowski, J. J., M. Brocke (eds), *The Lord's Prayer and Jewish Liturgy;* 3-20], New York.

Derret, J. D., (1983) 'Binding and Loosing (Matt 16:19; 18:18; John 29:23),' *Journal of Biblical Literature, 102* (1), 112-117.

Dobschütz, E. von (1914) 'The Lord's Prayer,' *The Harvard Theological Review, 7*(3), 293-321.

Dodds, E., (1965) *Pagan And Christian In An Age of Anxiety*, Cambridge.

Donaldson, T., (2007) *Judaism and the Gentiles: Jewish Patterns of Universalism (to 135 CE)*, Waco, TX.

Draper, J. A., (1996a) 'Christian Self-Definition Against the "Hypocrites" in Didache VIII,' [in Draper, J. A., (ed.), *The Didache in Modern Research;* 223-243], Leiden.
—, (1996b) 'The Didache in Modern Research: An Overview,' [in Draper, J. A., (ed.), *The Didache in Modern Research;* 1-42], Leiden.
—, (1996c) 'The Jesus Tradition in the Didache,' [in Draper, J. A., (ed.), *The Didache in Modern Research;* 72-91], Leiden.
—, (1996d) 'Torah And Troublesome Apostles in The Didache Community,' [in Draper, J. A., (ed.), *The Didache in Modern Research;* 340-363], Leiden.
—, (1997) 'Resurrection and Zechariah 14:5 in the Didache Apocalypse,' *Journal of Early Christian Studies, 5*(2), 155-179.
—, (1998) 'Weber, Theissen and "Wandering Charismatics" in the Didache,' *Journal of Early Christian Studies, 6*(4), 541-576.
—, (2000) 'Ritual Process and Ritual Symbol in Didache 7-10,' *Vigiliae Christianae, 54*(2), 121-158.
Dunn, G. D., (2004) *Tertullian,* London and New York.
Dunn, J. D., (1990) *Unity and Diversity in the New Testament*, [[1]1977], Philadelphia.
—, (1998) *The Christ & The Spirit: Pneumatology* [vol. 2; [1]1997], Grand Rapids, MI.
—, (2003) *Jesus Remebered,* Grand Rapids, MI.
—, (2006) *The Partings of the Ways*, [[1]1991], London.
Dupont, J., (1979) *The Salvation of the Gentiles: Essays on the Acts of the Apostles*, [Keating, R. (trans.)], New York.
Edmonds, P., (1980) 'The Lucan Our Father: A Summary of Luke's Teaching on Prayer?,' *The Expository Times, 91*(140), 140-143.
Edwards, R. A., (1969) 'The Redaction of Luke,' *The Journal of Religion, 49*(4), 392-405.
Ehrman, B. D., (2003) *Lost Scriptures: Books That Did Not Make it into the New Testament*, Oxford.
Elbogen, I., (1996) *Jewish Liturgy: A Comprehensive History*, [[1]1993], Philadelphia.
Elledge, C., (2005) *The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, Atlanta.
Ellenson, D., (1975) 'Ellis Rivkin and the Problems of Pharisaic History: A Study in Historiography,' *Journal of the American Academy of Religion, 43*(4), 787-802.
Elliot, J. H., (1993) *What is Social-Scientific Criticism?*, Minneapolis.
Engberg-Pedersen, T., (2010) 'Setting the Scene: Stoicism and Platonism in the Transitional Period in Ancient Philosophy,' [in Rasimus, T.,

T. Engberg-Pedersen, I. Dunderberg (eds), *Stoicism in Early Christianity;* 1-14], Grand Rapids, MI.

Eshel, H., (2008) *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Hasmonean State*, Grand Rapids, MI.

Esler, P. F., (1987) *Community and Gospel in Luke-Acts*, Cambridge.

—, (2002) 'Jesus and the Reduction of Intergroup Conflict,' [in Stegemann, W., B. J. Malina, G. Theissen (eds), *The Social Setting of Jesus and the Gospels;* 185-206; [1]2001], Minneapolis.

Farrar, F. W., (1907) *Lives of the Fathers,* London.

Ferguson, E., (2009) 'Tertullian,' *The Expository Times, 120*(7), 313-321.

Festugiere, A. J., (1954) *Personal Relgiion Among the Greeks,* Berkely and Los Angeles.

Fine, S., (1997) *This Holy Place,* Notre Dame, IN.

Finkelstein, L., (1925) 'The Development of the Amidah,' *The Jewish Quarterly Review, 16*(1), 1-43.

—, (1929) 'The Birkat Ha-Mazon,' *The Jewish Quarterly Review, 19*(3), 211-262.

Fishwick, D., (1964) 'On the Origin of the Rotas-Sator Acrostic,' *The Harvard Theological Review, 57*(1), 39-53.

Fleisher, E., (1990) 'On the Beginnings of Obligatory Jewish Prayer,' *Tarbiz, 59.*

Flint, P. W., J. C. VanderKam (eds), (1998-1999) *The Dead Sea Scrolls After 50 Years: A Comprehensive Assessment*, Leiden.

Flusser, D., (1996) 'Paul's Jewish-Christian Opponents in the Didache,' [in Draper, J. A. (ed.) *The Didache in Modern Research*; 194-211], Leiden.

Foster, R., (2002) 'Why on Earth Use "Kingdom of Heaven"?: Matthew's Terminology Revisited,' *New Testament Studies, 48*, 487-499.

Franklin, E., (1975) *Christ the Lord: A Study in the Purpose and Theology of Luke-Acts*, Philadelphia.

Gadamer, H.-G., (1989) *Truth and Method,* [[1]1975], London.

Gartner, B., (1965) *Temple and Community in Qumran,* Cambridge.

Geertz, C., (1968) *Islam Observed,* Chicago.

—, (1973) *The Interpretation of Cultures*, New York.

Giordano, C., I. Kahn, (2001) *The Jews in Pompeii, Herculaneum, Stabiae and in the Cities of Campania Felix*, Rome.

Gladwell, M., (2002) *The Tipping Point: How Little Things Can Make a Big Difference*, New York.

Gordon, R. P., (1974) 'Targumic Parallels to Acts XIII 18 and Didache XIV 3,' *Novum Testamentum, 16* (4), 285-289.

Grant, M., (1973) *The Jews in the Roman World,* New York.
Grant, R. M., (1963) *A Historical Introduction to the New Testament*, New York.
Greene, W. C., (1968) *Moira: Fate, Good, and Evil in Greek Thought*, [[1]1944], Gloucester, MA.
Gregory, A. F., C. M. Tuckett (eds), (2005) *Trajectories through the New Testament and the Apostolic Fathers*, New York.
Guelich, R. A., (1976) 'The Matthean Beatitudes:"Entrance-Requirements" or Eschatological Blessings?,' *Journal of Biblical Literature, 95* (3), 415-434.
Gundry, R. H., (1982) *Matthew: A Commentary on His Literary and Theological Art*, Grand Rapids, MI.
Gutman, J., (ed.), (1981) *Ancient Synagogues: The State of The Research*, Chico, CA.
Hagner, D. A., (1993) *Matthew 1-13*, Dallas.
Hall, S. G., (2005) *Doctrine and Practice in the Early Church*, [[1]1991] Eugene, OR.
Hamill, T., (1968) 'The Prayer of Jesus,' *The Furrow, 19*(10), 3-8.
Hamman, A., (1971) *Prayer: The New Testament,* Chicago.
Haran, M., (1988) 'Temple and Community in Ancient Israel' [in Fox, M. V. (ed.), *Temple In Society;* 17-26], Winona Lake, IN.
Harnack, A., (1896) *History of Dogma* (vol. 2), [Buchanan, N. (trans.)], London.
—, (1898) *History of Dogma* (vol. 5), [Millar, J. (trans.)], London.
Harril, J. A., (2010) 'Stoic Physics, the Universal Conflagration, and the Eschatological Destruction of the "Ignorant and Unstable" in 2 Peter,' [in Rasimus, T., T. Engberg-Pedersen, I. Dunderberg (eds), *Stoicism in Early Christianity*; 115-140], Grand Rapids, MI.
Hartshorne, C., (1984) *Omnipotence and other Theological Mistakes*, Albany, NY.
Hatch, E., (1957) *The Influence of Greek Ideas on Christianity*, [[1]1891], New York.
Heinemann, J., (1977) *Prayer in the Talmud: Forms and Patterns*, Berlin.
Henderson, I. H., (1992) 'Didache and Orality in Synoptic Comparison,' *Journal of Biblical Literature, 111*(2), 283-306.
Hengel, M., (1981) *Judaism and Hellenism:Studies in their Encounter*, [vol. 1; [1]1974], Minneapolis and Philadelphia.
Herford, R. T., (1962) *The Pharisees,* [[1]1925], Boston.
Hiers, R. H., (1985) '"Binding" and "Loosing": The Matthean Authorizations,' *Journal of Biblical Literature, 104* (2), 233-250.

Hoffman, L. A., (1979) *The Canonization of the Synagogue Service*, Notre Dame, IN.

—, (1991) 'Reconstructing Ritual as Identity and Culture,' [in Bradshaw, P. F., L. A. Hoffman (eds), *The Making of Jewish and Christian Worship*; 22-42], Notre Dame, IN.

Holmas, G. O., (2011) *Prayer and Vindication in Luke-Acts: The Theme of Prayer within the Context of the Legitimating and Edifying Objective of the Lukan Narrative*, London.

Holmen, T., (2007) 'An Introduction to the Continuum Approach,' [in Holmen, T. (ed.), *Jesus From Judaism to Christianity: Continuum Approaches to the Historical Jesus*; 1-16], London.

Holmes, O., (1960) 'Tertullian on Prayer,' *Tyndale Bulletin, 5-6*, 27-32.

Horsley, R. A., (1989) *Sociology and the Jesus Movement,* New York.

Hurvitz, A., (1982) 'The History of a Legal Formula,' *Vetus Testamentum, 32*, 257-267.

Idelsohn, A., (1995) *Jewish Prayer and its Development,* [[1]1932], Mineola, NY.

Jefford, C. N., (1989) *The Sayings of Jesus in the Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*, Leiden.

Jeremias, J., (1969) *Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus,* Philadelphia.

—, (1971) *New Testament Theology: The Proclamation of Jesus*, New York.

—, (1978) *The Prayers of Jesus,* [[1]1967], Philadelphia.

Jervell, J., (1972) *Luke and the People of God: A New Look at Luke-Acts*, Minneapolis.

Johnson, L. T., (1992) 'Luke-Acts,' [in Freedman, D. N. (ed.), *The Anchor Bible Dictionary* (vol. 4); 403-420], New York.

—, (2013) C*ontested Issues in Christian Origins and the New Testament: Collected Essays*, Leiden.

Juel, D., (1993) 'The Lord's Prayer in the Gospels of Matthew and Luke,' [in Migliore, D. L. (ed.), *The Lord's Prayer: Perspectives for Reclaiming Christian Prayer*; 56-70], Grand Rapids, MI.

Karris, R. J., (2000) *Prayer and the New Testament: Jesus and His Communities at Worship*, New York.

Kee, H. C., (1977) *Jesus in History: An Approach to the Study of the Gospels*, New York.

Kimelman, R., (1988) 'The Daily 'Amidah and the Rhetoric of Redemption,' *The Jewish Quarterly Review, 79*(2/3), 165-197.

Kistemaker, S.J., (1978) 'The Lord's Prayer in the First Century,' *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society, 21*(4), 323-328.

Kister, M., (2001) '5Q13 and the "Avodah": A Historical Survey and Its Significance,' *Dead Sea Discoveries, 8*(2), 136-148.

Klawans, J., (2006) *Purity, Sacrifice and the Temple: Symbolism and Supercessionism in the Study of Ancient Judaism*, New York.

Klink, E. W., (2004) 'The Gospel Community Debate: State of the Question,' *Currents in Biblical Research, 3*, 60-85.

Kloppenborg, J. S., (1995) 'The Transformation of Moral Exhortation in Didache 1-5,' [in Jefford, C. N. (ed.), *The Didache in Context: Essays on Its Text, History and Transmission;* 88-109], Leiden.

Knohl, I., (1996) 'Between Voice and Silence: The Relationship between Prayer and Temple Cult,' *The Journal of Biblical Literature, 115*(1), 17-30.

—. (2008) 'The Messiah Son of Joseph: "Gabriel's Revelation" and the Birth of a New Messianic Model,' *Biblical Archeological Review, 34 (05)*, 58-62, 78.

Koester, H., (1982) *History, Culture and Religion of the Hellenestic Age*, New York.

Kyu, S. H., (2000) 'Theology of Prayer in the Gospel of Luke,' *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society, 43*(4), 675-693.

Lafargue, M., (1988) 'Sociohistorical Research and the Contextualization of Biblical Theology,' [in Neusner, J., E. S. Frerichs, P. Borgen, R. Horsley (eds), *The Social World of Formative Christianity and Judaism*; 3-16], Minneapolis.

Lambrecht, J., (1985) *The Sermon on the Mount: Proclamation & Exhortation*, Wilmington, DE.

Lanier, D. E., (1992) 'The Lord's Prayer: Matt 6:9-13-A Thematic and Semantic Structural Analysis,' *Criswell Theological Review, 6* (1), 57-72.

Laymon, C. M., (1968) *The Lord's Prayer in its Biblical Setting,* Nashville and New York.

Leaney, R., (1956) 'The Lucan Text of the Lord's Prayer (Lk XI 2-4),' *Novum Testamentum, 1*(2), 103-111.

Levine, L. I., (1987) 'The Second Temple Synagogue: The Formative Years,' [in Levine, L. I. (ed.), *The Synagogue in Late Antiquity*; 7-33], Philadelphia.

—, (1996) 'The Nature and Origin of the Palestinian Synagogue Reconsidered,' *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 115(3), 425-448.

—, (2000) *The Ancient Synagogue: The First Thousand Years*, London and New Haven.

Lochman, J. M., (1993) 'The Lord's Prayer in Our Time: Praying and Drumming,' [in Migliore, D. L. (ed.), *The Lord's Prayer: Perspectives for Reclaiming Christian Prayer; 5-19*], Grand Rapids, MI.

Lohmeyer, E., (1965) *Our Father: An Introduction to the Lord's Prayer*, New York.

Luz, U., (1989) *Matthew 1-7: A Continental Commentary*, Minneapolis.

—, (1995) *The Theology of the Gospel of Matthew*, Cambridge.

—, (2005) *Studies in Matthew,* Grand Rapids, MI.

Maddox, R., (1982) *The Purpose of Luke-Acts,* Edinburgh.

Malina, B. J., (2001) *The New Testament World: Insights from Cultural Anthropology*, [[1]1981], Louisville, KY.

—, (2002) 'Social-Scientific Methods in Historical Jesus Research,' [in Stegemann, W., B. J. Malina, G. Theissen (eds), *The Social Setting of Jesus and the Gospels*; 3-26], Minneapolis.

Marshall, H. I., (1991) 'The Interpretation of the Magnificat: Luke 1:46-55,' [in Bussmann, C., W. Radl (eds), *Der Treue Gottes Trauen: Beiträge zum Werk des Lukas*; 181-196], Freiburg.

—, (1970) *Luke: Historian & Theologian*, Exeter.

—, (1990) *Jesus the Saviour: Studies in New Testament Theology*, Downers Grove, IL.

Martinez, F. G., (1990) 'A Groningen Hyposthesis of Qumran,' *Revue de Qumran*, 521-541.

Mason, S., (2000) 'Pharisees,' [in Evans, C., S. Porter (eds), *Dictionary of New Testament Background*; 782-787], Downers Grove, IL.

—, (2007a) 'Josephus's Pharieees:The Narratives,' [in Neusner, J., B. D. Chilton (eds), *In Quest of the Historical Pharisees*; 3-40], Waco, TX.

—, (2007b) 'Josephus's Pharisees: The Philosophy,' [in Neusner, J., B. D. Chilton (eds), *In Quest of the Historical Pharisees;* 41-66], Waco, TX.

Mazza, E., (1996) 'Didache 9-10: Elements of a Eucharistic Interpretation,' [in Draper, J. A. (ed.), *The Didache in Modern Research*; 276-299], Leiden.

McBryde, J. M., (1907) 'The Sator-Acrostic,' *Modern Language Notes, 22*(8), 245-249.

Meeks, W., (1983) *The First Urban Christians,* London and New Haven.

Meier, J. P., (1994) *A Marginal Jew: Rethinking the Historical Jesus*, [vol. 2; [1]1991], New York.

—, (2001) *A Marginal Jew: Companions and Competitors*, [vol. 3], London and New Haven.

Milavec, A., (1995) 'The Saving Efficacy of the Burning Process in Didache 16:5,' [in Jefford, C. N. (ed.), *The Didache in Context*; 131-155], Leiden.

—, (2003a) 'Synoptic Tradition in the Didache Revisited,' *Journal of Early Christian Studies, 11*(4), 443-480.

—, (2003b) *The Didache: Faith, Hope, & Life of the Earliest Christian Communities, 50-70 CE*, New York.

—, (2003c) *The Didache Text, Translation, Analysis, and Commentary*, Collegeville, MN.

—, (2003d) 'The Purifying Confession of Failings Required by the Didache's Eucharistic Sacrifice,' *Biblical Theoology Bulletin: A Journal of Bible and Theology, 33*(64), 64-76.

Milik, J. T., (1959) *Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judea* [Strugnell, J. (trans.)], London.

Moffat, J., (1919) 'Tertullian on the Lord's Prayer,' *Expository Times, 19*, 24-41.

Moxnes, H., (1994) 'The Social Context of Luke's Community,' *Interpretation, 48*, 379-389.

Mueller, J., (2007) 'The Ancient Church Order Literature: Genre or Tradition?,' *Journal of Early Christian Studies, 15*(3), 337-380.

Neusner, J., (1971) *The Rabbinic Traditions about the Pharisees before 70*, Leiden.

—, (1979) *From Politics to Piety: The Emergence of Pharisaic Judaism*, [¹1972], New York.

—, (1980) review of *A Hidden Revolution,* by Ellis Rivkin, *The American Historical Review, 85*(4), 863-864.

—, (1986) *Reading and Believing: Ancient Judaism and Contemporary Gullibility*, Atlanta.

—, (1988) 'Introduction,' [in Neusner, J. (ed.), *The Mishnah: A New Translation*; xiii-xlii], London and New Haven.

—, (1991) *Jews and Christians: The Myth of a Common Tradition*, London.

—, (2007) 'The Anglo-American Theological Tradition to 1970,' [in Neusner, J., Chilton, B. D. (eds.), *In Quest of the Historical Pharisees*; 375-394], Waco, TX.

Neusner, J., Chilton, B., (1995) *Judaism in the New Testament,* London.

Neydrey, J. H. (ed.), (1991) *The Social World of Luke-Acts: Models for Interpretation*, Peabody, MA.

Nickelsburg, G. W., (2003) *Ancient Judaism and Christian Origins,* Minneapolis.

Niederwimmer, K., (1998) *The Didache: A Commentary* [Attridge, H. W. (ed.); Maloney, L. M. (trans.)], Minneapolis.

Nijman, M., Worp, K., (1991) "Επιούσιος in a Documentary Papyrus?,' *Novum Testamentum, 41*(3), 231-234.

Okorie, A. M., (1997) 'The Implied Reader of Luke's Gospel,' *Religion and Theology, 4*(1-3), 220-228.

O'Loughlin, T., (2003) 'The Didache as a Source for Picturing the Earliest Christian Communities: The Case of the Practice of Fasting,' [in O'Mahony, K. (ed.), *Christian Origins: Worship, Belief and Society*; 83-112], Sheffield.

—, (2010) *The Didache: A Window on the Earliest Christians*, London: SPCK.

—, (2011) 'The Missionary Strategy of the Didache,' *Transformation: An International Journal of Holsitic Mission Studies*, 28(77), 77-92.

O'Neill, J., (1961) *The Theology of Acts in its Historical Setting*, London.

Osborn, E., (1997) *Tertullian, First Theologian of the West*, Cambridge.

Overman, J. A., (1990) *Matthew's Gospel and Formamtive Judaism*, [[1]1989], Minneapolis.

Palmer, G. H., (1920) 'The Lord's Prayer,' *The Harvard Theological Review, 13*(2), 124-135.

Patte, D., (1976) *What is Structural Exegesis?*, Philadelphia.

—, (1986) *The Gospel According to Matthew: A Structural Commentary on Matthew's Gospel,* Minneapolis.

Pennington, J. T., (2007) *Heaven and Earth in the Gospel of Matthew*, Leiden.

Perrin, N., (1963) *The Kingdom Of God In The Teaching Of Jesus*, Philadelphia.

Petuchowski, J. J., (1978b) 'The Liturgy of the Synagogue,' [in Petuchowski, J. J., M. Brocke (eds), *The Lord's Prayer and Jewish Liturgy*; 45-59], New York.

Plymale, S. F., (1991) *The Prayer Texts of Luke-Acts,* New York.

Rankin, D., (1995) *Tertullian and the Church,* Cambridge.

Ravens, D., (1995) *Luke and the Restoration of Israel*, Sheffield.

Reed, J., (1995) 'The Hebrew Epic and the Didache,' [in Jefford, C. N. (ed.), *The Didache in Context*; 214-225], Leiden.

Reif, S., (1993) *Judaism and Hebrew Prayer: New Perspectives on Jewish Liturgical History*, Cambridge.

Riches, J., (1980) *Jesus and the Transformation of Judaism*, London.

—, (2000) *Conflicting Mythologies: Identity Formation in the Gospels of Mark and Matthew*, Edinburgh.

—, (2004) *Matthew,* [[1]1996], London.

Rivkin, E., (1978) *A Hidden Revolution,* Nashville.

Rordorf, W., (1996) 'An Aspect Of The Judeo-Christian Ethic: The Two Ways,' [in Draper, J. A. (ed.), *The Didache in Modern Research*; 148-164], Leiden.

Roth, D. T., (2010) 'Marcion's Gospel: Relevance, Contested Issues, and Reconstruction,' *Expository Times, 121*, 287-294.

—, (2012) 'The Text of the Lord's Prayer in Marcion's Gospel,' *Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche*, 103(1), 47-63.

Rubenstein, R. L., (2010) 'What Was at Stake in the Parting of the Ways between Judaism and Christianity?,' *Shofar, 25*(3), 78-102.

Saldarini, A. J., (1988) *Pharisees, Scribes and Sadducees in Palestinian Society*, Grand Rapids, MI.

—, (1992) 'Pharisees,' [in Freedman, D. N., (ed.), *The Anchor Bible Dictionary* (vol. 5); 289-303], New York.

—, (1994) *Matthew's Christian-Jewish Community*, Chicago.

Sanders, E. P., (1990) *Jewish Law from Jesus to the Mishnah: Five Studies*, Philadelphia.

—, (1992) *Judaism Practice and Belief 63 BCE-66 CE*, Philadelphia.

Sandt, H. van de (2002) '"Do Not Give What is Holy to the Dogs" (Did 9:5D and Matt 7:6A): The Eucharistic Food of the Didache in Its Jewish Purity Setting,' *Vigiliae Christianae, 56*(3), 223-246.

Sandt, H. van de; D. Flusser, (2002) *The Didache: Its Jewish Sources and its Place in Early Judaism and Christianity*, Minneapolis.

Sandt, H. van de; J. K. Zangenberg (eds), (2008) *Matthew, James and Didache: Three Related Documents in Their Jewish and Christian Settings*, Atlanta.

Sarason, R. S., (2001) 'The "Intersections" of Qumran and Rabbinic Judaism: The Case of Prayer Texts and Liturgies,' *Dead Sea Discoveries, 8*(2), 169-181.

Schiffman, L. H., (1987) 'The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Early History of Jewish Liturgy,' [in Levine, L. I. (ed.), *The Synagogue in Late Antiquity*; 33-48], Philadelphia.

Schille, G., (1991) 'Grundzüge des Gebetes nach Lukas,' [in Bussmann, C., W. Radl (eds), *Der Treue Gottes Trauen: Beiträge zum Werk des Lukas*], Freiburg.

Schimanowski, G., (2004) 'Connecting Heaven and Earth: The Function of the Hymns in Revelation 4-5,' [in Boustan, R. S., A. Yoshiko Reed (eds), *Heavenly Realms and Earthly Realities in Late Antique Religions*; 67-84], Cambridge.

Schirmann, J., (1953) 'Hebrew Liturgical Poetry and Christian Hymnology,' *The Jewish Quarterly Review, 44* (2), 123-161.

Schollgen, G., (1996) 'The Didache as a Church Order: an Examination of the Purpose for the Composition of the Didache and its Consequences for Interpretation,' [in Draper, J. A. (ed.), *The Didache in Modern Research*; 43-71], Leiden.

Schurer, E., (1973) *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ*, [¹1890], Edinburgh.

Schwiebert, J., (2008) *Knowledge and the Coming Kingdom: The Didache's Meal Ritual and its Place in Early Christianity*, London.

Scott, E. F., (1951) *The Lord's Prayer: It's Character, Purpose and Interpretation*, New York.

Simpson, R. L., (1965) *The Interpretation of the Lord's Prayer in the Early Church*, Philadelphia.

Smalley, S. S., (1973) 'Spirit, Kingdom and Prayer in Luke-Acts,' *Novum Testamentum, 15*(Fasc 1), 59-71.

Smith, J. A., (1984) 'The Ancient Synagogue, the Early Church and Singing,' *Music & Letters, 65*(1), 1-16.

Smith, J. Z., (1972) 'The Wobbling Pivot,' *The Journal of Religion, 52*(2), 134-149.

Stagg, F., (1972) 'The Abused Aorist,' *Journal of Biblical Literature, 91*(2), 222-231.

Stark, R., (1997) *The Rise of Christianity,* San Francisco.

Steudel, A., (1993) 'The House of Prostration, CD XI 21-XII 1 — Duplicates of the Temple,' *Revue de Qumran, 16*, 49-68.

Stevenson, K. W., (2004) *The Lord's Prayer: A Text in Tradition*, Minneapolis.

Stewart-Sykes, A., (2004) *Tertullian, Cyprian, Origen: On the Lord's Prayer*, Crestwood, NY.

Strange, J. F., (1997) 'First Century Galilee from Archeology and the Texts,' [in Edwards, D. R., C. T. McCollough (eds), *Archeology and the Galilee: Texts and Contexts in Graeco-Roman and Byzantine Periods*; 39-48], Atlanta.

Suggs, M. J., (1972) 'The Christian Two Ways Tradition: Its Antiquity, Form, and Function,' [in Aune, D. (ed.), *Studies in New Testament and Early Christian Literature: Essays in Honor of Allen P. Wikgren*; 60-74], Leiden.

Talbert, C. H., (2006) *Reading the Sermon on the Mount: Character Formation and Ethical Decision Making in Matthew* 5-7, [¹2004], Grand Rapids, MI.

Talmon, S., (1989) *The World of Qumran from Within*, Jerusalem.

Tannehill, R. C., (1986) *The Narrative Unity of Luke-Acts: A Literary Interpretation*, Philadelphia.

—, (2005) *The Shape of Luke's Story*, Eugene, OR.

Teicher, J., (1963) 'Eucharistic Prayers in Hebrew (Dura-Europos Parchment D.pg 25),' *The Jewish Quarterly Review, 54*(2), 99-109.

Theissen, G., (1977) *Sociology Of Early Palestinian Christianity*, Philadelphia.

—, (1982) *The Social Setting Of Pauline Christianity*, Philadelphia.

—, (1992a) *Social Reality And The Early Christian's Theology, Ethics, And The Word View Of The New Testament*, Minneapolis.

—, (1992b) *The Gospels in Context: Social and Political History in the Synoptic Tradition*, London.

Thompson, G., (1959) 'Thy Will be Done in Earth as it is in Heaven (Matthew 6:11): A Suggested Re-Intrepretation,' *The Expository Times, 70*, 379-381.

Thompson, M. B., (1998) 'The Holy Internet: Communication Between Churches in the First Christian Generation,' [in Bauckham, R. (ed.), *The Gospels for All Christians*; 49-90], Grand Rapids, MI.

Tilborg, S., (1972) 'A Form-Criticism of the Lord's Prayer,' *Novum Testamentum, 14*(2), 94-105.

Tov, E., (2000) 'A Qumran Origin for the Masada Non-Biblical Texts?,' *Dead Sea Discoveries, 7*(1), 57-73.

Trudinger, P., (1989) 'The "Our Father" in Matthew as Apocalyptic Eschatology,' *Downside Review,*(107), 49-54.

Trumper, M., (2004) 'The Oldest Original Synagogue Building in the Diaspora: The Delos Synagogue Reconsidered,' *Hesperia, 73*(4), 513-598.

Unnik, W., (1980) 'Luke-Acts, a Storm Center in Contemporary Scholarship,' [in Keck, L. E., J. L. Martyn (eds), *Studies in Luke-Acts*; 15-33], Philadelphia.

Volk, K., (2004) '"Heavenly Steps": Manilius 4.119-121 and Its Background,' [in Boustan, R. S., A. Yoshiko Reed (eds), *Heavenly Realms and Earthly Realiities in Late Antique Religions*; 34-46], West Nyack, NY.

Voobus, A., (1968) *Liturgical Traditions in the Didache*, Stockholm.

— (1969) 'Regarding the Background of the Liturgical Traditions in the Didache: The Question of Literary Relation between Didache IX.4 and the Fourth Gospel,' *Vigilae Christianae, 23*(2), 81-87.

Watson, F., (1998) 'Toward A Literal Reading of the Gospels,' [in Bauckham, R. (ed.), *The Gospel For All Christians*; 195-217], Grand Rapids, MI.

Weinfeld, M., (2003) 'The Litany "Our God In Heaven" and its Precedents in the Dead Sea Scrolls,' [in Chazon, E. (ed.), *Liturgical Perspectives: Prayer and Poetry in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls*; 263-269], Leiden.

Wenham, D., (2010) 'The Sevenfold Form of the Lord's Prayer in Matthew's Gospel,' *The Expository Times, 121*(8), 377-382.

Werner, E., (1970) *The Sacred Bridge,* [[1]1959], New York.

White, L. M., (1987) 'The Delos Synagogue Revisited Recent Fieldwork in the Graeco-Roman Diaspora,' *The Harvard Theological Review, 80*(2), 133-160.

Wilkin, R. L., (1984) *The Christians as the Romans Saw Them*, London and New Haven.

Williams, R. H., (2006) 'Social Memory and the Didache,' *Biblical Theology Bulletin, 36*(35), 35-39.

Wright, N. T., (1992) *The New Testament and the People of God*, Minneapolis: Fortress.

—, (1996a) *Jesus and the Victory of God,* Minneapolis.

—, (1996b) *The Lord and His Prayer,* Grand Rapids, MI.

Yeivin, Z., (1993) 'Chorazin,' [in Stern, E. (ed.), *The New Encyclopedia of Archaeological Excavations in the Holy Land* [vol. 1; 301-304], New York.

Young, B., (1984) *Jewish Background To The Lord's Prayer*, Austin, TX.

Zahavy, T., (1990) *Studies in Jewish Prayer,* Lanham, MD.

—, (1991) 'The Politics of Piety: Social Conflict and the Emergence of Rabbinic Litrurgy,' [in Bradshaw, P. F., L. A. Hoffman (eds), *The Making of Jewish and Christian Worship*; 41-62], Notre Dame, IN.

Zagzebski, L., (2011) 'Foreknowledge and Free Will,' *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* [(Fall 2011 Edition); Zalta, E. N. (ed.); URL = <http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/fall2011/entries/free-will-foreknowledge/>].

Zeitlin, S., (1964, January) 'The Tefillah, the Shemoneh Esreh: An Historical Study of the First Canonization of the Hebrew Liturgy,' *The Jewish Quarterly Review, 54*(3), 208-249.

INDICES

I. Scripture and Apocrypha

II. Old Testament Pseudepigrapha

III. Dead Sea Scrolls

IV. Philo & Josephus

V. Mishnah, Talmud, Rabbinic and Related Literature

VI. Apostolic Fathers

VII. Greco-Roman Literature

VIII. Patristic Literature

IX. Modern Authors